United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
FORTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records

55th
PLENARY MEETING

Monday, 15 November 1993
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. INSANALLY
(Guyana)

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 32

COMPLETE WITHDRAWAL OF FOREIGN MILITARY FORCES FROM THE TERRITORIES OF THE BALTIC STATES

(a) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/48/501)

(b) DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/48/L.17/Rev.2)

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now hear a statement by the Prime Minister of the Republic of Latvia, His Excellency Mr. Valdis Birkavs, in the course of which he will introduce draft resolution A/48/L.17/Rev.2.

Mr. Valdis Birkavs, Prime Minister of the Republic of Latvia, was escorted to the rostrum.

The PRESIDENT: I have great pleasure in welcoming the Prime Minister of the Republic of Latvia, His Excellency Mr. Valdis Birkavs, and inviting him to address the General Assembly.

Mr. BIRKAVS: The draft resolution that I have the honour to introduce addresses the most important and urgent matter now confronting Latvia and the other Baltic States: the continued illegal presence of the military forces of the Russian Federation on the territories of Latvia and Estonia.

The matter of the complete withdrawal of foreign military forces from the territories of the Baltic States is being discussed by the General Assembly at the same time as the Republic of Latvia is celebrating the 75th anniversary of the Declaration of its independence. The State of Latvia was proclaimed in 1918, and by 1920 it was recognized by the world community. When celebrating an anniversary like this, every nation remembers the severe battles it had to fight in order to gain and protect its independence. The realization that every effort will be made to retain this independence becomes more acute.

Unfortunately, following the period of growth and well-being before the Second World War, the Baltic States and their peoples were tried in a very severe way. At the beginning of the 1940s, as a result of an agreement between two totalitarian Powers, the independence of the Baltic States was lost, and for 50 years independence was only a dream. The actions of their peoples, the end of the cold war and the collapse of communism gave the three Baltic States the opportunity to re-establish their independence. We immediately embraced that opportunity and restored our independence in 1991.

Many representatives know that only after the establishment of independence in their own countries did the most difficult period of their development begin. Since the re-establishment of our independence in 1991 much has been achieved. However, much remains to be done. We have to strengthen our independence and make every effort to ensure that we never lose it again. Our efforts are made especially difficult by the presence of foreign military forces stationed on our territory without our consent.

I believe that this audience in particular, containing so many representatives of States which gained their

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, Room C-178, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

93-87177 (E)

Distr. GENERAL

A/48/PV.55
26 November 1993

ENGLISH

independence quite recently, understands how important sovereignty is to every nation. To secure it, we have to overcome many obstacles. The main obstacle to successful development and the most potent factor of instability in the Baltic region still remains the presence of Russian troops on the territory of two sovereign States, Latvia and Estonia. The removal of this problem from Lithuania is a positive development. However, the last 3,000 troops that recently departed from Lithuania represented only 12 per cent of the total of Russian Federation troop strength in the Baltic States. Since the Soviet Baltic military district was headquartered in Latvia, my country had the heaviest troop concentration of all three States.

The present Russian Federation North-West Military Area Group still has its headquarters in Riga and retains control over 22 intelligence and counter-intelligence units, 211 military facilities, including air and naval installations, and over 96,000 hectares of the territory of Latvia. Of over 18,000 Russian military personnel stationed in Latvia, about one half are officers.

In terms of sheer numbers, fewer troops have been removed from Lithuania and Poland, and, eventually, will have been removed from Estonia, than remain based in Latvia.

I should like to detail the efforts made by my country to deal with the situation of foreign military forces stationed on its territory without its consent. Latvia has been seeking a reasonable solution to this problem through bilateral negotiations. After our parliamentary elections in June of this year, the first - and I stress, the first - order of business was the formation of a new delegation to the negotiations. Two rounds of talks have already taken place, and the third round is under way at this very moment in Jurmala, Latvia. Having solved a number of technical or secondary removal-associated problems, both parties have exhausted the limits of compromise without reaching agreement on three fundamental issues: the early, orderly and complete withdrawal of Russian Federation military forces from our territory.

In spite of General Assembly resolution 47/21, adopted on 25 November 1992, and paragraph 15 of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) "Helsinki Document 1992 - the Challenges of Change" and in spite of calls by many Governments for the early, orderly and complete withdrawal of Russian Federation troops, there has not been significant progress on the part of the Russian Federation in fulfilling these requirements. In fact, the Russian Federation has put forward several conditions and acted in contradiction to the requirements of - again, I must stress - an early, orderly and complete withdrawal.

First, a year after the adoption of resolution 47/21 on this issue, an agreement on troop withdrawal has yet to be signed; thus, the requirement for an early withdrawal has not been respected. Secondly, although some forces have departed, an inspection of vacated military facilities in Latvia, revealing ransacked buildings and rusting hulks, demonstrates that withdrawal has not been orderly. Thirdly, the requirement that withdrawal be complete has been subverted by the Russian Federation's demands to maintain some facilities in Latvia until the turn of the century.

The Russian Federation has demanded social guarantees for its retired military personnel and housing for its military personnel withdrawn from Latvia. Recent statements by the Russian Federation's Minister of Defence demonstrate that the Russian Federation could again resort to the so-called human-rights issue in order to halt troop withdrawal from Latvia and Estonia. The use of the Russian-speaking population in Latvia and Estonia as a tool to achieve political or military-political goals in fact puts the Russian-speaking population in the position of hostages, benefiting neither party.

Another difficult issue on the negotiations agenda is the question of the so-called strategic facilities which the Russian Federation is seeking to keep in Latvia for many years. This issue is burdened, in part, by the negative historical experience of the people of Latvia. These "strategic" facilities are perceived as military bases which could once again serve as a pretext for the occupation of Latvia, as was the case in 1940. Latvia will extend the deadline for the relocation of these facilities only if real international security guarantees and a reasonably tight internationally controlled schedule for relocation are given. We categorically reject the Russian Federation's request to maintain these facilities for an extended period of time. However, within the boundaries I have just mentioned, we are willing to compromise.

Rhetoric regarding the Russian-speaking population and the desire to retain some military facilities leaves room for doubt as to whether the Russian Federation has the political will to remove its troops from Latvia. This gives the impression that the Russian Federation still wants to keep its military presence in the region.

Clearly, Latvia cannot solve all its problems by itself, and it depends greatly on the involvement and support of the international community. Just as clear is the acknowledgment that no State can expect the international community to solve all of its problems. But can the mouse be expected to conduct bilateral negotiations with the cat on the subject of the removal of the mousetrap?

In this respect, we believe that the repeated adoption of General Assembly resolutions on this issue will reassure us about the sincerity of the Russian Federation's intentions and will help Russian leaders adopt a political decision which would solve once and for all the issue of the withdrawal of Russian Federation troops in the Baltic States.

More weight will be attached to these resolutions if they are adopted by consensus. It is our hope that the Russian Federation will effectively pursue the implementation of General Assembly resolution 47/21, the draft resolution now under consideration and the CSCE Helsinki Document.

We are well aware of all the difficulties the Russian Federation is confronting in its efforts to build democracy after long years of totalitarian rule. Latvia supports the ongoing democratic processes in the Russian Federation. However, none of Russia's problems or difficulties can be solved at the expense of the independence or statehood of its neighbours.

The United Nations is an Organization entrusted by its Member States with the primary responsibility of maintaining international peace and security. Though the main responsibility in this field rests on the Security Council, the General Assembly has its own competence as well, and it has been successful in exercising it, especially when possible steps by the Security Council towards international peace and security were hindered by the cold war between the super-Powers.

Now that the cold war and the bipolarity of the world have ended, contradictions between the big Powers no longer constitute the main threat to peace and security in the world. The security of small States gradually comes to the foreground. These States are particularly interested in strengthening the international security institutions and making the most effective use of them.

The nature of conflicts in the modern world has changed; hence, the instruments for dealing with them have changed as well. Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, has rightly pointed out that the most desirable and efficient use of diplomacy is to ease tensions before they result in conflict.

Ironically, the use of preventive diplomacy is not always rewarding. If it succeeds, there may not be demonstrative results, while, if it fails, the conflicts which emerge attract the attention of the world. The removal of the Russian Federation troops from the Baltic States can serve as a good example of preventive diplomacy in action, yielding evident results. Measures taken within the United Nations framework, in particular resolution 47/21, have been a notable contribution, as a result of which the Russian Federation has completely pulled its troops out of Lithuania.

If a flight from Riga, Latvia, to New York takes nine hours, should not the return flight from New York to Riga take nine hours as well? When one ponders this question, it must be remembered that in 1940 Soviet troops, in gross violation of international law, entered and occupied the free, independent Baltic States in a matter of days. Since Moscow had clearly formulated its decision to occupy the Baltic States, the Army had no practical or technical difficulties in implementing its plan. However, now that 50 years have elapsed, it is high time to do away with the consequences of this gross violation of international law. It appears that two years have not been enough to remove the troops or even to agree upon the time by which they will be removed.

But, in fact, that is time for decision. We thank the Secretary-General for his efforts to implement resolution 47/21. The appointment of a Special Envoy, Ambassador Tommy Koh of Singapore, who headed a good-offices mission to the Baltic States and the Russian Federation, led to greater international understanding of this issue. The good-offices mission was of the type envisaged by the Secretary-General in his report "An Agenda for Peace" (A/47/277) and should serve as an example of cooperation and early prevention enhancing transparency and the peaceful settlement of disputes.

However, the Member States and the international community should not stop there; the process of early prevention must continue. We urge the Russian Federation, the other Member States and the international community to continue to work toward the early, orderly and complete withdrawal of foreign military forces from the territories of Latvia and Estonia - for early prevention, for regional and international peace and security, and for justice.

The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank the Prime Minister of the Republic of Latvia for the statement he has just made.

Mr. Valdis Birkavs, Prime Minister of the Republic of Latvia, was escorted from the rostrum.

Mr. OSVALD (Sweden): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the five Nordic countries: Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden.

The withdrawal of Russian troops from the Baltic countries is an issue of major importance. It will

substantiate the independence of the Baltic States and strengthen security and stability in the Baltic Sea region. More than a year has now elapsed since Russia made its commitment concerning a complete withdrawal of troops from the Baltic countries. It is more than two years since Russia recognized the re-established independence of the Baltic States.

The Nordic countries have regarded it as an important task to try to assist - together with other countries - in accelerating the withdrawal of Russian troops from the territories of the Baltic States. The demand for an early, orderly and complete withdrawal of Russian troops from the Baltic States - in accordance with the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) Helsinki Summit - still stands.

The continued stationing of foreign forces in the territory of independent States without their agreement is unacceptable. The Russian military forces in Estonia and Latvia have been reduced in numbers, but the remaining troops must be withdrawn in the immediate future.

We welcome the withdrawal of troops from Lithuania as a positive step towards the fulfilment of the Helsinki Final Act. We believe that it is of the utmost importance that the countries concerned agree as soon as possible on a date by which the withdrawal should be completed. The demand for such a withdrawal cannot be linked to the solution of any other political issue.

The Nordic countries understand the practical, social and economic problems Russia faces in connection with the withdrawal of troops, and we realize that outside assistance to alleviate some of these difficulties could be helpful. We have already made, or are prepared to make, contributions to solving various practical questions, including housing problems of the returnees, and assume that this will contribute to the rapid completion of the withdrawal of troops from Estonia and Latvia. We urge other countries to take similar measures to this end. Also, we urge the Russian Government not to use the question of such assistance to delay the withdrawal process, which could be completed in practice very soon.

The Nordic countries consider a completion of the withdrawal of Russian military forces from all the Baltic countries an important step on the road to improving relations between the Baltic countries and Russia. Good and trusting relations between these countries will increase the conditions for intensified cooperation in the North European area as a whole.

The Secretary-General's report (A/48/501) on the issue of troop withdrawal from the Baltic States is a good summary of the present situation and the problems that remain to be solved. The Special Envoy, Ambassador Tommy Koh, has been faced with a very complicated issue. We welcome the Secretary-General's readiness to provide his good offices to facilitate the process of withdrawal.

The Nordic countries support the draft resolution (A/48/L.17/Rev.2) put forward under this agenda item by the Baltic States following successful consultations with the Russian Federation. We view it as a sign of good will on both sides that a consensus agreement was reached also this year. The adoption of this draft resolution would underscore once again the importance the international community attaches to the withdrawal of these troops in compliance with the principle of international law as expressed, *inter alia*, by the CSCE: the presence of foreign troops on the territory of a sovereign State requires the consent of that State.

Let us hope that when the Secretary-General submits his report on this issue at next year's session of the General Assembly, he will be able to report that all foreign troops have been withdrawn from the territories of all the Baltic States.

Mr. VORONTSOV (Russian Federation) *(interpretation from Russian)*: The Russian Federation is making active efforts to build full-fledged good-neighbourly relations with Latvia and Estonia and is doing its utmost to ensure the earliest possible settlement of the problems existing in our relations.

Unfortunately, a number of problems remaining from the past still exist in the relations of Russia with Latvia and Estonia. We are trying to resolve them through common efforts, in a spirit of mutual respect and on the basis of understanding the sources and substance of those difficulties which our States are experiencing at this historically important period of their development.

One such problem is the continuing, although considerably reduced, presence of military forces of the former Soviet Union in Latvia and Estonia, which Russia had to take under its jurisdiction as the successor State of the Soviet Union. The full withdrawal of troops from Lithuania within the agreed-upon time-frame, despite the fact that the agreements finalizing legal aspects of the withdrawal have not been completed, would constitute reaffirmation of Russia's good will and its determination to solve this problem.

Since the consideration of this question at the forty-seventh session considerable progress has been achieved in the withdrawal of Russian troops from Latvia and Estonia.

On Latvian territory their numbers have been reduced from 57,000 at the beginning of the withdrawal to 17,000 today - that is, to less than one third. In Estonia, their number has dropped from 25,000 to 4,000, a reduction to less than one sixth.

The problem of the withdrawal of the Russian troops still deployed in Latvia and Estonia is not political. Our country has taken a clear and unequivocal decision on the complete withdrawal of these troops from the territories of the Baltic States. Moreover, we are attempting to complete that withdrawal as early as is technically possible. Russia has no intention of delaying the withdrawal of Russian troops from Latvia and Estonia or of using the issue to exert pressure with regard to other aspects of bilateral relations. In particular, in the course of the negotiating process with Latvia and Estonia we are not linking the issue of withdrawal with the decision on such vital issues for us as the protection of the rights of the Russian-speaking population in those countries.

Unfortunately, work on the agreements to provide a legal basis for solving the set of problems related to troop withdrawal, including the legal, social, material and financial issues involved, has been excessively drawn out. For this, we believe, the Russian side is not to blame. We regret the delay because in our relations with other States of Central and Eastern Europe such issues, when raised, were quickly resolved in a spirit of cooperation and compromise. In this connection, we note a certain imbalance in the provisions of the draft resolution, in that it deals with the "delay" in the troop withdrawal, but does not mention the real and complex problems, whose solution would contribute to a speedy agreement on withdrawal.

We note with satisfaction that in the most recent rounds of bilateral talks between the State delegations of Russia, Latvia and Estonia certain signs of progress in resolving these problems were seen. In particular, in the last round of Russian-Latvian talks it was possible to agree on a set of important provisions regulating issues of troop withdrawal. Nevertheless, such key issues as the date of completion of the withdrawal, the fate of certain strategic installations and the problems of ownership and mutual settlement of payments remain open. But here, too, certain positive shifts are beginning to occur.

One serious obstacle to a speedy completion of troop withdrawal from Latvia and Estonia, as the Secretary-General recognizes in his report, is the problem of building the necessary housing in Russia for troops and family members returning from Latvia and Estonia. In this connection, we welcome the intention expressed by the Government of the Republic of Estonia to seek resources for the construction of housing in Russia, which would enable us to consider the possibility of the withdrawal of troops from that country earlier than the date we had outlined - that is, before the end of 1994. We also welcome the statement we have just heard from the representative of Sweden that the Nordic countries also intend to assist with regard to building housing. We consider that this would also be of great assistance in accelerating troop withdrawal.

It would help set a mutually acceptable timetable for troop withdrawal from Latvia if the Latvian side were to pay compensation for housing now occupied by Russian military personnel in that country. Those funds would make it possible to build or acquire housing in Russia. The Russian military personnel themselves cannot privatize or sell their houses because of discriminatory Latvian legislation, as distinguished from the situation in Lithuania.

The Secretary-General's report pays well-deserved attention to the problem of retired Russian military personnel and family members permanently residing in Latvia and Estonia, who today number approximately 90,000. It is clear from the report that the current situation in which they find themselves can only be described as tragic. Under the terms of the Law on Aliens adopted by the State Assembly of the Republic of Estonia on 8 July 1993, they are deprived of the right to obtain residence permits and are obliged to leave the country, even though the overwhelming majority of them have no housing in Russia. In addition, there have been instances of forced cancellation of the residence permits of retired military personnel, of their being fired from jobs and of threatened deportation from Estonia. The Estonian side has not yet accepted the recommendations of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) High Commissioner on National Minorities with regard to the need to provide this category of the population with the right to obtain residence permits. There are signs that a similar situation may evolve in Latvia as well.

We share the conclusion of the Secretary-General's report, with regard to the issue of the status and social benefits of retired military personnel, that

> "a reasonable response to Russian concerns would be for Estonia to accept CSCE and United Nations suggestions with regard to the decree that is being formulated to implement the Law on Aliens". *(A/48/501, para. 22)*

We also share the Secretary-General's call on Latvia to take into account the opinions and recommendations expressed by the missions sent to that country by the United Nations, the Council of Europe and the CSCE, and

to take positive and urgent measures with regard to the issues concerning retired Russian military personnel. We expect that this acute humanitarian aspect of the problem will soon also find a civilized solution in the negotiations on troop withdrawal, on the basis of the norms and principles of international humanitarian law.

In conclusion, I should like to reaffirm our determination to settle all problems in Russia's relations with Latvia and Estonia in a spirit of cooperation and good-neighbourliness, responsibility and constructiveness. We note with satisfaction that in general during the consultations on the draft resolution between our delegation and the delegations of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia a spirit of cooperation prevailed, ultimately allowing us to arrive at the consensus text which is now before the General Assembly.

Mr. NOTERDAEME (Belgium) *(interpretation from French)*: I have the honour of speaking on behalf of the European Union on the agenda item dealing with the complete withdrawal of foreign military forces from the Baltic States.

Under General Assembly resolution 47/21 the Secretary-General sent his Special Envoy, Mr. Koh, to the Baltic States in late August and early September last. Mr. Koh's mandate was to offer his good offices in connection with the question of the withdrawal of Russian troops from the Baltic States. The report he prepared on the outcome of his mission offers us grounds for optimism and for disappointment.

We have grounds, in the first place, for optimism, because the complete withdrawal of Russian units from the territory of Lithuania, which was concluded on 31 August last, opened the way to complete normalization of relations between Lithuania and the Russian Federation. The European Union welcomes this successful outcome and we call on Lithuania and the Russian Federation to resolve definitively matters that are still pending.

We have grounds for disappointment because, although the Russian Federation has already proceeded to repatriate some of its troops, no agreement has yet been reached on complete withdrawal from the territories of Latvia and Estonia. In keeping with the Helsinki Summit Declaration of July 1992 - "The Challenges of Change" - which emphasized that the Russian Federation had an obligation to withdraw its troops from the Baltic States, the European Union once again calls on the States concerned to continue their efforts with a view to concluding the bilateral agreements needed for the early, orderly and complete withdrawal of Russian troops from Estonian and Latvian territory, without linking that withdrawal to any other problems.

It should be possible for the conclusion of the agreement between Lithuania and the Russian Federation to serve as an example of how to resolve the continuing disputes with Latvia and Estonia. Without disregarding the practical difficulties facing the Russian Federation in withdrawing its troops from Latvia and Estonia, the European Union cannot agree that these difficulties should be allowed to jeopardize the implementation of the principle of international law that the presence of foreign troops on the territory of another State requires its consent.

Once again the European Union expresses the hope that the States involved will continue efforts with a view to settling their disputes definitively so that they can open a new era of peaceful and mutually beneficial relations and put an end to the distrust inherited from the past. Against this background, the European Union reiterates its support for the efforts being made by Mr. Koh, the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General, and for his good offices.

For those reasons, the European Union supports the draft resolution now before us.

The PRESIDENT: I wish to announce that the list of speakers for item 32 is now closed.

Mrs. FRECHETTE (Canada): Canada, Australia and New Zealand are pleased to support the draft consensus resolution before the Assembly on the complete withdrawal of foreign military forces from the territories of the Baltic States.

Last year we adopted a resolution on this question along much the same lines as the text before us. Some progress has been made: we welcome the withdrawal of troops from Lithuania, completed on schedule last August. We regret, however, that one year since its adoption, and two years after the independence of the Baltic States was recognized by the international community, this issue still remains to be resolved.

With regard to the foreign troops remaining in Estonia and Latvia we encourage the parties to continue their dialogue and look forward to an early resolution of their differences. We urge all parties to show flexibility and a greater recognition of the challenges faced by others in fulfilling this objective.

We reiterate our belief that progress on troop withdrawal cannot be linked to other non-related issues. At the same time, we recognize that a host of social and environmental problems connected to the long-standing

presence of foreign troops on Baltic soil exists and must be solved in a spirit of cooperation.

We thank the Secretary-General for his comprehensive report and welcome his active engagement in this process. Good-offices missions, such as the one undertaken by the Secretary-General's Special Envoy, Mr. Koh, are particularly helpful.

(spoke in French)

We have taken note of the Secretary-General's call concerning the role Member States and regional organizations might play in helping to resolve the remaining questions. We believe regional organizations may be able to help all the parties to reach an understanding on this issue and on others related to peace and stability in the Baltic region.

The draft resolution before us reaffirms the efforts made by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) to help the parties. We support the decisions of the CSCE at its Helsinki and Stockholm meetings in 1992. We welcome the information on troop withdrawal regularly provided in the CSCE context by all the parties.

The CSCE also contributes to regional stability through long-term preventive-diplomacy missions to the region: one has operated for some time in Estonia and one will shortly be established in Latvia. Such initiatives serve to lessen tensions and promote greater understanding between communities.

Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania have made great strides in consolidating their sovereignty and independence. An early, orderly and complete withdrawal of foreign troops from Estonia and Latvia will contribute to security and stability in the region and to good-neighbourly relations, and will serve as an example for the international community.

Mr. GHAFOORZAI (Afghanistan): The Afghan delegation reiterates its principled policy on the item under consideration - that is, our conviction that the inadmissible and unjustifiable presence of foreign military forces in the territory of another State without the consent of the State in question is inadmissible and unjustifiable. The continuing presence of foreign military forces on the territories of Estonia and Latvia cannot be an exception. However, the withdrawal from Lithuania of the last Russian combat unit on 31 August 1993 has been a positive development since the General Assembly considered the item last year. Unfortunately, it must be noted that no agreement on the terms of the troop withdrawal from other Baltic States has been reached in the meantime.

While we see a desire on the part of the Russian Federation to abide by the call of the last session of the General Assembly to - *inter alia* - conclude without delay a timetable for the early, orderly and complete withdrawal of their forces from the territories of Estonia and Latvia, the objective has yet to be fully achieved.

We commend the efforts of the Secretary-General and his Special Envoy, Ambassador Tommy Koh, to discharge the mandate which the General Assembly entrusted to the Secretary-General to use good offices to attain the objective of the early, orderly and complete withdrawal of foreign forces still stationed in Estonia and Latvia.

The technical and practical problems involved and presented as reasons for delayed withdrawal will never be understood by world public opinion. These practical issues should in no way delay the complete, orderly and early withdrawal of the foreign forces from the territories of all Baltic States.

We believe that continued cooperation, as well as the taking of immediate and practical steps by the Russian Federation towards the implementation of General Assembly resolution 47/21 of 25 November 1992, including an early date for troop withdrawal, would create a positive atmosphere of good will and trust under which all the issues that are impeding the implementation of that resolution would be peacefully and expeditiously resolved.

No foreign military force is a pleasant phenomenon in the mind of a nation. It is a logical conclusion, therefore, to believe that the presence of the foreign troops in Riga, the capital of Latvia, and Tallinn, the capital of Estonia, is offensive to the peoples of these two countries.

To Afghanistan, as the victim of foreign military aggression not too long ago, which feels the pain and suffering of the people in those countries that are still experiencing the presence of foreign military forces in their territories, the continued delay in completing the withdrawal is a matter of concern. It jeopardizes and threatens the early establishment of normal and good relations between the Russian Federation and the Baltic States. It violates the sovereignty of Estonia and Latvia and contributes to the intensification of tension in the area. Therefore the immediate and complete withdrawal of the forces is in the interest of the Russian Federation and other States concerned, in the interest of peace and tranquillity of the region, and in the interest of an atmosphere of understanding conducive to the attainment of the ideals for which this Organization has fought since its inception.

The Afghan delegation is of the opinion that the continued endeavours of regional organizations, such as the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and the Council of Europe, as well as the commendable practical assistance of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Denmark, Norway and the United States, will enable our Organization to mark the early and complete withdrawal of foreign military forces from the Baltic States.

We salute the determination and perseverance of the freedomloving nations of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia towards seeing their beloved homelands completely free from foreign domination. The Afghan nation shared their joy and pleasure when they celebrated their independence.

We believe it is a moral responsibility to ensure that each Member State benefits from an atmosphere of trust and understanding brought about by the end of the cold war and of world polarization. Let us leave aggression to the past and build new relations based upon respect for each other's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity. Let animosity belong to the past, and let us build new roads towards sincere friendship. Let others believe that we have faith and trust in dialogue and negotiations as the only way to solve our problems. And let us prove to our future generations that our dedication to peace and human rights laid down the foundation of world relations under which they will live with no fear of the use or threat of use of force, the dangers of war or violations of human rights. Let us enable our sons and daughters to enjoy their human dignity and collectively strive for the peace and progress of their environment. It is our determination that will make such ideals a reality.

Mr. ERDŐS (Hungary) *(interpretation from French)*: Pursuant to resolution 47/21, adopted by the General Assembly just one year ago, the item on the complete withdrawal of foreign military forces from the territories of the Baltic States remains on the agenda of the Assembly, which is to be kept informed of progress towards its implementation. We note with satisfaction that following talks, the armed forces of the Russian Federation were completely withdrawn from the territory of Lithuania in August 1993; and, despite the remaining problems, this provides impetus to the talks now under way between the Russian Federation and the two other Baltic countries. This achievement demonstrates eloquently that disputes between States can be settled if there is the true political will to succeed, if both sides are willing to compromise, and if each side takes account of the legitimate interests of the other. We feel sure that if this spirit prevails in the talks, then the matter before us today can quickly be cast aside and disappear once and for all from the agenda of the General Assembly.

The Secretary-General's excellent report on this item, based on information collected by Ambassador Koh, Special Envoy of the Secretary-General, provides an overview of developments, and is generally positive as to the outcome of the talks and as to the contribution the United Nations can make in dealing with this dispute and in preserving international and regional peace and security. The question of the complete withdrawal of foreign military forces from the Baltic countries is a very complex issue. It requires from all of the parties concerned patience, perseverance, political wisdom and special efforts to establish the atmosphere of trust and good will essential to the constructive continuation and successful conclusion of the talks.

Hungary knows from its own experience how important it is to have a responsible and flexible approach, to take account pragmatically of the interests at stake, and to avoid rash statements or actions; without these positive elements, the talks will be impeded by even more difficult obstacles. This is an approach that we feel can lead without undue delay to the conclusion of appropriate agreements, including a timetable on the early, orderly and complete withdrawal of foreign military forces from the territories of Estonia and Latvia. In this undertaking, the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe is called upon to play a primary role, and this will no doubt help to ensure that any outstanding issue can be resolved in ways acceptable to all parties involved on the basis of sovereign equality and in the spirit of good-neighbourliness.

In this context, we note that all the parties are fully in agreement on the need for the withdrawal of the armed forces of the Russian Federation from the territories of the Baltic States. We believe, however, that the talks on implementing this goal must be continued with dynamism and consistency, for the persistence of the present situation is becoming increasingly anachronistic in a Europe which has now freed itself from old political and ideological constraints. We hope that the countries involved will rise to the occasion and conclude, as soon as possible, bilateral agreements on eliminating one of the last vestiges of a bygone era.

The draft resolution is in keeping with the expectations of the international community and suggests the path to be followed. Hungary is happy that once again all delegations concerned support it and that it will therefore be adopted without a vote.

Mr. SIMUTIS (Lithuania): The Lithuanian delegation has the honour to be among the sponsors of draft resolution A/48/L.17/Rev.2, entitled "Complete withdrawal of foreign military forces from the territories of the Baltic States", under item 32 of the agenda of the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly.

Lithuania is one of the Baltic States, and it is a source of great satisfaction to me to report to the General Assembly that last year's resolution on this subject, resolution 47/21, has been fulfilled as far as Lithuania is concerned. During 1992 and 1993, Lithuania and the Russian Federation conducted long and intensive negotiations in an attempt to reach a comprehensive agreement on the withdrawal of the military forces of the Russian Federation from Lithuania. The two sides could not reach an agreement on all aspects of the withdrawal and issues connected with it; hence, a comprehensive withdrawal agreement could not be achieved. However, on 8 September 1992, a detailed timetable for departure of the Russian troops was agreed upon and signed. The timetable set 31 August 1993 as the final date for the withdrawal of those troops from Lithuania.

In spite of many difficulties and disagreements, which in the final few days led to a suspension of the withdrawal, the final date specified in the timetable agreement was met. Fifteen minutes before midnight on 31 August 1993, the last combat unit of the Russian armed forces crossed the border and left the territory of Lithuania.

The withdrawal of the Russian troops has resulted in a marked improvement in relations between Lithuania and the Russian Federation. It dissipated the mutual resentments and suspicions that had influenced actions and positions of the two sides while the foreign military forces were stationed in Lithuania. The people of Lithuania had perceived these forces as troops of occupation since 1940, when they marched in uninvited, and they stayed for half a century. Their presence and their armed might enabled the Soviet Union to annex our country illegally, and to carry out arrests, executions and massive deportations of our population to Siberia and other harsh regions of the former Soviet Union. Under the cover of the army of occupation, great suffering was imposed on our people. Now that the army has left, the process of healing can begin again.

The continued presence of armed forces of the Russian Federation in Estonia and Latvia raises troubling questions about their ultimate purpose. Particularly troubling is the demand of the Russian Federation for military bases and facilities in Latvia. This is completely unacceptable, since the presence of military bases and facilities forces that independent country into Russia's military sphere without its consent and thus violates its sovereignty and independence.

Lithuania suffered the same long years of Soviet occupation as Estonia and Latvia, and shared with them the joy of liberation and the restoration of our independence. Lithuania fully supports the demand of Estonia and Latvia for the early, orderly and complete withdrawal of the military forces of the Russian Federation from their territories. Maintaining foreign military forces on the territory of another State without its consent is contrary to international law.

Therefore, Lithuania appeals to the international community to uphold international law and to support the draft resolution, which calls for an early, orderly and complete withdrawal of foreign military forces from Estonia and Latvia.

Mr. JAAKSON (Estonia): The Latvian Prime Minister, in introducing the agenda item entitled "Complete withdrawal of foreign military forces from the territories of the Baltic States", dealt primarily with aspects of this problem that I do not intend to dwell on. They apply equally well to the situation in Estonia, except for the number of troops remaining and the number of bases occupied. Rather, I would like to point out the historical context that makes procrastination in the Russian Federation's removal of its troops from our soil so threatening to our security and to international peace. I would like to add that, although I shall speak about Estonia, the situation I shall describe applies equally well to Latvia and Lithuania.

Estonia established its independence after a solemn declaration by the Soviet Russian Government on 15 November 1917 that all nations had a right to self-government and could separate from the Tsarist empire. Our independence was proclaimed on 24 February 1918. No sooner had independence been declared than Estonia was attacked by both the Soviet and the German armies. Fortunately, the attackers did not prevail and Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs Georgi V. Chicherin proposed negotiations, which led to the cessation of hostilities and to peace. The Peace Treaty of Tartu was signed on 2 February 1920. Article 2 of the Treaty states in part that:

> "... Russia unreservedly recognizes the independence and autonomy of the State of Estonia, and renounces voluntarily and forever all rights of sovereignty formerly held by Russia over the Estonian people ...".

This solemn treaty provision was honoured for four years. On 1 December 1924 the Soviet Government massed troops on the Estonian border and incited an uprising against the democratically elected Government. The uprising failed miserably, and the long hand of Russian complicity was exposed.

In 1932 Estonia signed a non-aggression Treaty with Moscow which stated, among other things:

> "The High Contracting Parties mutually undertake to abstain from any act of aggression against one another ..."

This Treaty was honoured until 1939 when, in collusion with Hitler, Soviet Russia was given a free hand in the Baltic area. The Nazi-Soviet Protocol states:

> "In the event of a territorial or political rearrangement in the areas belonging to the Baltic States, the northern boundary of Lithuania shall represent the boundary of the spheres of influence of Germany and the USSR."

For the Soviet Union, the Nazi-Soviet pact represented a disavowal of the principles underlying every major international agreement concluded by the Soviet Government with its neighbours since 1917.

About a month after the Nazi-Soviet pact was signed, Estonia was presented with an ultimatum by Moscow demanding its accession to a "mutual assistance" pact, under whose terms Estonia was compelled to hand naval and air bases over to the Soviet Union and provide for a garrison of 25,000 Soviet troops. Estonia was given less than eight hours to respond to this ultimatum. When Estonia acceded to the Soviet demands, its fate was sealed. The bases and troops were used to launch an aggressive war against Finland and to undermine Estonian sovereignty; within a year, this led to Estonia's annexation by the Soviet Union.

In 1988 the Supreme Soviets of the then Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian SSRS declared the Nazi-Soviet pact void of any legal standing. A similar conclusion was reached by the Congress of People's Deputies of the Soviet Union in 1989. However, sufficient steps have not been taken to eliminate the consequences of that pact. Four years have elapsed since this historic admission was made by the Congress of People's Deputies. The time has come to honour that admission.

If it were not for these bitter historic lessons of broken treaties and the subversion of our independence through the stranglehold of Soviet Russian bases, we might be more lenient and understanding about the stationing of Russian Federation troops on our soil. However our memories are too vivid. Fifty years of oppression resulted from our agreement to permit the stationing of foreign troops on our soil. The trials and tribulations of our people are too great to recount on this occasion.

Estonia now asks the Russian Federation, as a successor State to the Soviet Union, to honour the peace treaty Estonia had concluded with Soviet Russia and to respect our sovereignty and international law. Is that too much to ask?

It is easy to say that we should not worry too much about the remaining troops on our soil and that the troops will eventually leave Estonia and Latvia as they recently left Lithuania. The Russian side has repeatedly said that the deadline for troop withdrawal is basically related to housing for the troops. This argument lacks any legal content and cannot be considered the reason to keep forces on the territory of another State without the consent of that State. However, we recognize that this is a problem to be solved.

We are concerned that the Russian Federation is looking for excuses to keep its troops in Estonia as long as possible by attempts to link the troop withdrawal to the situation of the "Russian-speaking population" in Estonia. In a statement made here on 28 September it was said:

> "Russia has made peacemaking and the protection of human rights, particularly those of national minorities, the priority of its foreign policy, first and foremost in the territory of the former USSR." *(Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings, 6th meeting, p. 15)*

The danger of this logic for Estonia is in considering us a part of the former Soviet Union, without recognizing our continued statehood, established in 1918.

Estonia is also accused of violating the human rights of the "Russian-speaking population" in Estonia, despite the fact that no human rights violations have been found by many expert missions of the United Nations, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) and the Council of Europe. According to this logic, it would appear that troops in Estonia may become useful for peace-keeping purposes.

The Russian Federation has implied that it would need a clear mandate from the United Nations and the CSCE for the better accomplishment of its peace-keeping activities. As long as the Russian Federation claims special rights in the "near abroad" its impartiality is questionable.

Therefore, we cannot really speak of traditional peace-keeping. As long as the troops of the Russian Federation remain on our soil, we have reason to feel insecure.

Mr. NOBILO (Croatia): The date 17 September 1991 was one of the great and important days in the history of the United Nations, when the new political and old historical realities in the Baltic States were finally and justly recognized by the granting of full United Nations membership to the Republics of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia.

It was a giant step towards the new post-cold war order, and a harbinger of independence and sovereignty for many other nations. Eight months later, the Republic of Croatia - together with Bosnia and Herzegovina and Slovenia - also became a Member State of the United Nations.

There is not the slightest doubt that the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia must be fully respected and if necessary protected by the world community. Without the approval of the host State, no foreign troops can be situated within its internationally recognized boundaries. The Baltic States cannot be an exception to this rule, which is the pillar of regional and global stability. Therefore, Croatia supports the complete withdrawal of foreign military forces from the territories of Latvia and Estonia.

Any serious delay in this process, contrary to the agreed timetable, would jeopardize the basic principles for which this Organization stands. Croatia therefore calls for the precise implementation of the timetable for the withdrawal of these troops. The positive experience of the withdrawal of foreign troops from other Eastern European countries should serve as a guideline to the Baltic States as well.

Parallel to the problem of a foreign military presence in the Baltics, some serious questions relating to the protection of human rights in that area are emerging. It is our opinion that these two problems must be dealt with separately and cannot be considered in the same context. All the existing human rights questions in the Baltic States, especially the minority problems, must be considered and resolved without rattling military sabres. The presence of foreign troops within the territories of sovereign States, in the name of protecting the social, cultural, ethnic, linguistic or religious rights of minorities, cannot justify any effort to promote human rights. These questions have to be resolved through the internal political process and legislation with full respect for international norms and standards with regard to human rights and in close cooperation with the relevant international institutions and bodies.

Croatia firmly supports the view that preventive diplomacy is the most desirable and effective means of easing tensions and achieving just and lasting solutions. Unfortunately, preventive diplomacy failed in the Balkans on the territories of the Republic of Croatia and the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. History has recently taught us the cruel lesson of how horrible crimes can be committed in the name of protecting someone's human rights. We must not forget Serbia's unfounded statement that the rights of Serbian people in Croatia and in Bosnia and Herzegovina were being violated or its use of its military presence on the territories of these two States Members of the United Nations to launch a brutal act of aggression designed to seize as much of their land as possible.

Easing tensions that could create a new regional crisis or expand existing ones is today one of the major goals of the work of the United Nations. In the light of that effort, two major principles must be fulfilled. The first one is full respect for, and protection of, human and minority rights. The other is the full and unconditional withdrawal of uninvited foreign military forces from the territories of sovereign States Members of the United Nations. The violation of one of these principles cannot justify blocking the fulfilment of the other.

By supporting this draft resolution, we are urging all the parties - the Baltic States and the Russian Federation - to proceed in the direction of finding mutually acceptable and peaceful solutions without linking two different processes, thus helping to strengthen European and global stability.

The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item.

The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/48/L.17/Rev.2. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/48/L.17/Rev.2 was adopted (resolution 48/18).

The PRESIDENT: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 32?

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 151

UNITED NATIONS INITIATIVE ON OPPORTUNITY AND PARTICIPATION: DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/48/L.19)

The PRESIDENT: I call on the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Papua New Guinea, Mr. John Kaputin, to introduce draft resolution A/48/L.19.

Mr. KAPUTIN (Papua New Guinea): I am pleased to open the debate on agenda item 15, which bears the title "United Nations initiative on opportunity and participation".

It is only a little more than a year since I had the honour of proposing the initiative in this Hall. Though I was - as I remain - convinced that the proposal deals with issues of global concern, I was able at that time to speak only on behalf of Papua New Guinea. Today, I address the Assembly in the knowledge that the proposal enjoys the support of many other Governments, regional and international organizations, groups of United Nations Members and non-governmental organizations.

In the Asia-Pacific region alone, the proposal has been formally and unanimously endorsed by the South Pacific Forum, the Melanesian Spearhead Group and the Association of South-East Asian Nations. It enjoys the backing of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries as well as of members of the Group of 77, the Forum of Small States, the Alliance of Small Island States and regional groups in widely scattered parts of the world. It has been discussed and favourably received not only in developing but in advanced industrial countries.

The proposal is being supported in practical ways by the United Nations Development Programme, which has provided assistance for a regional workshop on opportunity and participation. It is being encouraged by a large and growing number of non-governmental organizations.

In addition, I am pleased to announce the recent receipt of a letter welcoming the initiative from the European Co-President of the Joint Assembly of the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States and the European Community.

As the size of the book distributed to all delegations outlining the origins, nature and evolution of the proposal suggests, the idea that the United Nations should sponsor a study of practical options for increasing opportunity and participation has grown from a glimmer into a well-illuminated - and, I believe, illuminating - idea.

As far as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is concerned, the theme embodied in the Papua New Guinea Government's proposal has become a beacon for efforts to grapple with what the *Human Development Report 1993* describes as "the central issue of our time": development of, for and by people.

We are debating the proposed United Nations initiative on opportunity and participation at a time when the issues affecting the economic future of significant parts of the world are about to be determined. Within hours, the fate of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) may be decided. A few days later, leaders from countries involved in the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum are due to meet. In exactly a month, the deadline for completion of the Uruguay Round of negotiations on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) expires.

Although the Governments of developing countries are generally not key players, the decisions which will be made - or will not, as the case may be - are of the greatest importance to their economies and their peoples' welfare. Whatever the outcome, a serious effort to review options for maximizing opportunity and participation, particularly, though not exclusively, for citizens in the economies of developing countries, will be required if the current decline in the economic prospects in and of many developing countries is to be halted, let alone reversed.

The world is going through a phase which has been aptly described as a time of extraordinary change in world affairs. The particular aptness of that description arises from its having been included in a report prepared by a body, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), which acts as a guardian for future generations. In UNICEF's words,

> "much of the developing world is today facing the worst financial famine of the modern era. ...
>
> "But despite ... [the] problems, the prospects for progress have been profoundly improved by the enormous ... upheavals of recent years". *(The State of the World's Children 1993, p. 20)*

There is, so UNICEF believes, "new hope for world development". If certain situations can be avoided, then

> "there is real hope of achieving sustained economic growth". *(ibid., p. 11)*

But what is the basis for that hope? As the number, seriousness and variety of items on the General Assembly's agenda suggest, more of the world is changing - more

dramatically and in more ways - than at any time in the previous 48 years of the United Nations experience.

As the late 1980s have turned into the 1990s, and the current decade has advanced, so previous - once seemingly permanent - international alignments have collapsed or been disbanded. Many orthodox ideas have met, or face, a similar fate. Much that seemed certain during the cold war has been left behind. Old uncertainties have re-emerged. New uncertainties continue to arise, to grow and to spread.

Despite a number of obvious successes, particularly in and by newly industrializing countries, the difficulties and prospects facing many developing countries seem not only to be getting worse, but to be doing so at an ever increasing rate. In most parts of the developing world - or, should I say those parts of the world where development is needed and wanted, though not necessarily attained - there is what the report of the South Commission described in 1990 at page 79, as

> "a deep awareness of the limitations of past development strategies and a growing conviction that the way out of the present crisis does not lie in returning to those strategies".

The *Human Development Report 1993* makes much the same point in similar terms.

As regards the international community's approach to conditions, including needs, plans and aspirations, in many developing countries, I can do no better than to repeat the observation made in the Secretary-General's latest annual report on the work of the Organization:

> "A new, workable and widely agreed concept of development still eludes us." *(A/48/1, para. 8)*

The hope for improvement is real enough, but the basis for hope is less than clear.

The Secretary-General's gloomy conclusion applies even in countries like Papua New Guinea, where gross national product per head of population is currently rising at more than 9 per cent a year. Put quite simply, not enough is being done, and not enough is known, about the most effective options for increasing or, even more importantly, linking opportunity and participation.

In proposing the initiative embodied in the draft resolution on opportunity and participation, the Papua New Guinea Government is not claiming that it has already found the concept which the international community seeks. But we believe that a comprehensive, systematic and thorough study of practical options for maximizing opportunity and participation, with particular reference to the citizens and the economies of developing countries, can help in the search. It can, we believe, make a potentially valuable contribution towards the improvement of conditions in countries where development is a widely shared need and goal, if not yet an actual achievement.

In line with our commitment to the United Nations, development and sustainability, we believe that such a study can serve interests which are shared across differences between developed and developing countries, national and regional boundaries, and generations. We certainly think that the composition, work and recommendations of the panel that carries out the study should be consistent with such widespread interests. We strongly believe that an acceptable and practical report must be based on genuine commitment, and be directed to furthering common interests.

The outcome should be a globally relevant contribution to a global concern that ought to be regarded as a global responsibility: a practical addition to processes of sustainable development in which human beings, regardless of individual, ethnic and socio-economic differences, are, as the Rio Declaration says they should be, at the centre.

Concepts and words that are widely employed in relation to developing countries by States Members and specialized agencies of the United Nations suggest a certain weariness with discussion, failure in practice and exhaustion of ideas. I refer, in particular, to the widespread use of terms such as "reconstruction", "recovery" and "revitalization".

Increasing aid fatigue, so-called, in the advanced industrial countries seems to have a counterpart in a growing fatalism about the prospects for significant change in many developing countries.

Not only language but thought and, even more importantly, what is being done, about development seem to be in urgent need of what is being widely described as reactivation.

At the same time, needs, pressures and openings for scarce resources continue to grow around the world, including in countries whose economies are in transition from State control to markets. As a result, development in and of many developing countries depends on more being done with less, at least for the foreseeable future.

The interests of everyone involved in or with developing countries will be better served if opportunity

and participation are maximized, or at least increased, and then sustained for the benefit of succeeding generations. The mutuality of these interests extends from the people and the Governments of the developing countries themselves to aid donors, commercial and concessional lenders, investors and trading partners, as well as neighbours and other concerned human beings. In fact, only if opportunity and participation are both increased and linked can the sustainable development of our planet become a realistic goal.

In short, the Government of Papua New Guinea believes that adoption of the draft resolution before us serves a common world-wide and inter-generational interest. It is on the basis of such a belief that we originally proposed the appointment of a panel of distinguished expert and experienced persons, broadly representative of the international community, to identify options for increasing opportunity and participation, with particular, though not exclusive, reference to the economies of developing countries. It is on exactly the same basis that we now seek the General Assembly's support for the draft resolution's adoption.

In many parts of Africa, Asia, Latin America and the South Pacific, including Papua New Guinea, many people are still looking for ways of entry into the cash economy. Others are trying to increase their involvement.

While the particular combination of features in some areas may be unique, the overall situation is not. Many difficulties are either identical or similar to problems faced by people seeking opportunities to participate in the economies of other countries. Experience at other times and in other places may help in the identification or application of local, national and regional solutions.

Markets are widely regarded as almost automatically offering opportunities for economic participation. The transition from State control to markets is often expected to produce just as automatic an increase in the size, number and variety of economic openings.

But problems can be difficult to identify; they can be even more difficult to overcome. Practical means of bringing about the improvement and effective use of access can frequently be elusive. Securing a link between opportunity and participation is vital for meaningful development to occur.

In many countries, limits on opportunity and participation have been inherited, imposed or in some other way imported from abroad, often before, and sometimes after, independence. Possible methods for reducing, removing or otherwise overcoming their effects can sometimes be found, or adapted from approaches which have been tried abroad. A thorough understanding of relevant problems, a systematic analysis of possible options and a comprehensive exchange of experiences and ideas are likely to be necessary, helpful and productive.

Members of many delegations will be familiar with the sorts of problems that citizens of developing countries have in capitalizing their resources. They will be aware of the inability - verging on unwillingness - of many financial institutions to lend on the basis of personal promise, education, skill or land held under traditional tenure systems. They will know of obstacles that lie in the way of attempts to vest ownership, management or control of commercial enterprises in traditional kin or ethnic groups and to safeguard traditional inheritance rules. They will have observed the operation of policies and procedures which favour and further entrench already established interests, thus hindering prospective new entrants from competing effectively in some markets. Many will be aware of difficulties such as the way in which even specialized agencies of the United Nations call for tenders for aid-funded projects which are either so large or subject to such technical specifications that local firms simply cannot compete.

Though relevant authorities in developing countries are often themselves committed to change, many find it hard to identify, let alone to implement, alternative methods of avoiding, reducing, removing or otherwise countering unwelcome, unnecessary and unfair limitations on citizens' opportunities for meaningful participation.

But there are alternatives deserving of close consideration. The manner in which villagers in my home area in Papua New Guinea have gathered coconuts and traditional shell-money to buy shares in a locally owned corporation is a case in point. The way in which close kin can be given responsibility for repayment of small loans to would-be entrepreneurs in Indonesia is another.

Though it cannot avoid addressing external factors, the ad hoc panel proposed in the draft resolution is likely to find itself concerned primarily with difficulties which can be removed and options which can be expanded as a result of local, national and regional action. Much of its work may, in practice, take the form of a global information exhange: an active example of world-wide collective self-reliance, involving North-South, South-South, regional and interregional cooperation.

But I am predicting, not prescribing.

The principal purpose of the project is to learn, share experiences, and explore ideas. It is, in fact, precisely

because relevant obstacles, options and answers often have still to be identified that a panel of the kind outlined in the draft resolution is required.

The proposal which forms the basis of the draft resolution is intended to ensure that the United Nations itself take the initiative on an issue of the greatest importance to many Members and, as I have already argued, of potential benefit to all. The first and second preambular paragraphs draw attention to circumstances of and in many developing countries, which the initiative is intended to address.

The third implicitly recognizes the need to avoid duplication and encourages members of the proposed panel to see themselves as paving the way, providing a complement and giving assistance, by way of elaboration, to the Secretary-General's efforts in preparing an agenda for development.

The fourth preambular paragraph acknowledges the responsibility and role of the United Nations in promoting development in all parts of the world.

The next preambular paragraph makes it plain that the proposed initiative is focused on developing countries, while being relevant and offering potential benefits to other parts of the world.

The sixth preambular paragraph is designed to direct the panel's attention to documents which help to explain the origins, development and intended purpose of its task while respecting its independence and not instructing it in exact detail on what to do.

The remaining paragraphs in the preamble - the seventh, eighth and ninth - are intended to place the initiative in the context of other United Nations activities, plans and resolutions of particular relevance to developing countries.

Operative paragraph 1 acknowledges the work being carried out in relation to development problems elsewhere in the United Nations system, particularly by the Secretary-General.

In order to avoid duplication or the creation of further ongoing institutions, the following paragraph makes it clear that the proposed panel is to be set up to perform a specific and important task. The range of experience and expertise on which it draws should be diverse.

Operative paragraph 3 asks the Secretary-General to assume responsibility for selecting the panel's members in consultation with Members of the United Nations, including regional groups. It specifies when its work should begin. It sets a firm limit on its duration. It is intended to keep costs to a minimum consistent with achieving the desired result, by encouraging the Secretary-General to recruit from existing sources of appropriately skilled and informed advice, while allowing him to draw on others, including bodies which are either not named or under-represented on current lists.

Consistent with recognition of the financial constraints within which the entire United Nations currently functions - constraints reflected in operative paragraphs 3 and 4 - I should like to draw the General Assembly's attention to the commitment which I have already announced on behalf of the Government of Papua New Guinea to make a special donation of 100,000 Kina - approximately $102,000 - to help fund the panel's work.

I should also like to reinforce the recommendation made by the Non-Aligned Movement's Standing Ministerial Committee for Economic Cooperation that other Governments and interested parties consider making special donations of their own. In fact, the Government of Papua New Guinea thinks the overall project is so vital to our national interests that we are prepared to consider providing other forms of assistance, including hosting such meetings as might be appropriate for the panel to hold in our region.

Operative paragraph 5 is intended to ensure that efforts to identify and implement options for maximizing opportunity and participation will not be limited to one effort within the United Nations system. Other bodies will be encouraged to contribute what they can.

The first Global Conference on the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States, the International Conference on Population and Development, the World Summit for Social Development and the fourth World Conference on Women come readily to mind.

The overall effect of the paragraph is to direct attention towards extending the consideration of relevant issues beyond the ad hoc panel in time, through other bodies, and to activities which complement and might play a part in giving effect to its recommendations.

Operative paragraph 6 provides for transparency and accountability by asking the Secretary-General to see that the General Assembly is kept informed of the panel's work.

The final paragraph ensures that Members can review - and comment on - the panel's work.

As I have said in the introduction to the book *Opportunity and Participation*, both

> "... are near-universal human aspirations. Linked, as in practice they must be for meaningful development to occur, they are important objectives for policy-makers in Governments, non-governmental bodies, as well as regional and international organizations, in almost every part of an ever-more interdependent world."

The initiative which will result from the adoption of the draft resolution is intended to advance global interests.

I therefore commend the draft resolution to all Members of the United Nations, and ask that it be adopted by consensus.

It gives me great pleasure to conclude by drawing the General Assembly's attention to the diversity of the draft resolution's original co-sponsors. In doing so, I have the honour to acknowledge with deep appreciation the co-sponsorship of the delegations of Algeria, Bahamas, Barbados, Benin, Fiji, Grenada, Indonesia, Israel, Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Namibia, Samoa, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. I also acknowledge with appreciation the co-sponsorship, formally given only after the text of the draft resolution had been issued, by other delegations, including Belize and Mongolia.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members that there is a correction to the text in the English version of the draft resolution. In the third line of operative paragraph 3, the word "may" is replaced by the word "will", so that the phrase now reads: "so that they will commence their study in January 1994". Other language versions will be adjusted accordingly if need be.

Mr. BLANEY (United States of America): The United States welcomes this opportunity to address the General Assembly on expanding economic opportunity and participation, and is pleased to support the spirit of the draft resolution put forward by the delegation of Papua New Guinea.

My delegation believes that the draft resolution before us is of great relevance to the economies of all Member States, especially the economies of developing countries and countries in transition. True economic development depends on the participation of individuals in their economy, and by extension of countries in international economic relations; opportunity is a key to participation at all levels of economic development.

Certain long-standing, inherited or externally imposed interests can have the effect of impeding market mechanisms. Therefore, the ability to maintain successful economic conditions and to create new opportunities within developing countries and economies in transition is greatly hampered, with the sum effect of impeding participation in development. By joining consensus on this text, Member States will have agreed to address impediments to economic opportunity and participation.

My delegation recognizes that this initiative draws much strength from the consensus outcome of the activities of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, Agenda 21 and the Commission on Sustainable Development.

Therefore, my delegation is pleased to note that the draft resolution makes use of the Commission on Sustainable Development's roster of experts for the purpose of assembling this study panel.

The panel, balanced in its representation of members, would address this initiative in the light of the current international economic, administrative, regulatory environment. It would pay close attention to interrelationships between economic development issues and issues commonly associated with social development - poverty, human resource development and health. Social realities have a direct bearing on economic development, and neither can be improved at the expense of the other. Finally, we must take great care to account for the least developed countries' interests in implementing the initiative before us.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): Australia supports what we see as the major objective of the Papua New Guinea economic initiative, which is to mobilize untapped domestic resources and create economic opportunities for local people. The need to improve economic opportunities for, and the participation of, people in developing countries remains a challenge of the utmost importance. It calls for the close attention of the international community, and we would welcome further work to identify practical options to increase opportunities for, and participation of, local business and all social sectors in developing countries.

At the launch of this initiative in the debate at the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly, the Foreign Minister of Papua New Guinea, the Honourable John Kaputin, said that the initiative was in some respects

> "the economic counterpart to 'An Agenda for Peace'". *(A/47/PV.30, p. 22)*

Australia strongly supports the Papua New Guinea Government's view that enhanced economic security is a major contributing factor to enduring peace and stability. Indeed, Australia's Foreign Minister, Senator Gareth Evans, in his book *Cooperating for Peace*, introduced in this Hall in October, paid much attention to the need for social and economic development in the development of peace-building strategies.

We further note the view of the Papua New Guinea Foreign Minister, expressed at the forty-seventh session, that the Papua New Guinea economic initiative should be seen as a practical contribution to the agenda for development. As the United Nations approaches its fiftieth anniversary, we face an urgent need to reassess the role of the Organization - and of the whole international community - on the pressing issue of development. Australia strongly supports the aims of an agenda for development and looks forward to the Secretary-General's interim report on progress in its preparation.

Senator Evans also devoted much attention in his book to the issue of rationalization of United Nations administration and resources. Australia attaches particular importance to enhanced coordination within the United Nations system and to the effective use of its limited resources. In this light, and in view of the links between the underlying objective of the Papua New Guinea initiative and related United Nations activities, Australia favours the exploration of ways in which the initiative could be harmonized with other processes currently under way, such as an agenda for development.

The potential institutional and budgetary implications of establishing a new expert panel suggest the need also to explore whether an appropriate existing panel could pursue the objectives of the Papua New Guinea initiative. Discussion on this matter would need to take place in the context of further information on estimates of the likely budgetary impact of the initiative, and on the mandates of existing expert panels.

The United Nations currently has three panels of experts with a mandate to address development issues: the High-Level Advisory Board on Sustainable Development, the roster of experts attached to that Board and the Committee for Development Planning. The future of the latter Committee in fact remains to be resolved.

Australia welcomes the intention of the Papua New Guinea Government to make a financial contribution to the realization of its initiative.

Australia has studied with interest the background documents circulated by Papua New Guinea in support of its proposal: the proceedings of both the national Papua New Guinea and the regional workshops hosted by that country during 1993 to develop the initiative. Australia would like to see clarified what we understand to be suggestions that a more protectionist approach, or raising economic barriers rather than lowering them, may be part of the answer to the problem of linking opportunity with participation for local people. It is Australia's strong view that reducing, rather than raising, the barriers to trade between economies will enhance economic opportunity and participation.

Mr. GEORGE (Federated States of Micronesia): For a newly-emerged island country such as the Federated States of Micronesia there can be no higher priority than development, and we are not alone. It is the most widely and constantly discussed subject here at the United Nations. The world itself is divided in many ways, but in no way more familiar to us than between developed and developing countries, or as it is often put, between North and South. One hundred and twenty-seven of the United Nations Members, more than two thirds, devote the bulk of our energies here to one thing - development.

This is not surprising, because the United Nations, in concept, is largely about securing the future, and without development most of the people of the world face a very grim future. But, for all the focus up to this point on what is surely a most central concern of mankind, results have been very uneven. Huge sums have been spent, and in some developing countries great progress has been made, while in others it seems that all the expert analysis, all the planning and all the conferences have made little difference. Even where progress has occurred, too often we see it impacting favourably upon the lives of only limited groups within societies, while thousands, even millions, of others wait in vain for the fruits of development.

In other words, there is a need to find ways of making more efficient use of increasingly scarce assistance dollars, and of reaching those who are not reached by the development process. The draft resolution to launch the United Nations initiative on opportunity and participation addresses that need, in the view of my delegation, in a most appropriate way. Accordingly, I take this occasion to reiterate the strong support of the Federated States of Micronesia, which was expressed here by Secretary Resio Moses during the general debate. We are proud to co-sponsor the draft resolution and are grateful to the Government of Papua New Guinea, to Minister John Kaputin and to Ambassador Lohia for their vision and untiring efforts in bringing this matter forward.

My country is one of many that stand to benefit enormously by the process called for in the draft resolution. My people have for a number of years had access to various forms of assistance, primarily from the United States, both as inhabitants of a Trust Territory and, more recently, as citizens of an independent country. We now also receive increasing aid from several of our neighbours in the Asia-Pacific region. As a United Nations Member, we are working with the Asian Development Bank and the World Bank group, and we are participating to the extent we can in all the many ongoing processes of this body aimed at encouraging development. Finally, we participate in a number of Pacific regional organizations, where we join with our island brothers to address common developmental problems.

But with all this, the pace of development has been and remains very slow in my country. While it is true that today visitors are struck by the advances made in several of our urban centres, much of the rest of the country is little different, and for a great many of our people life is largely unchanged. Worst of all, those people have little prospect of becoming part of the process of advancement. Is it because they lack ambition? No - thanks to modern telecommunications, they are very much aware of their position. Do they lack energy? Certainly not - survival at, or near, subsistence level is hard work. Are they oppressed by their leaders? Again, no. Ours is a thoroughly democratic society, and our strong, extended-family system makes our leaders, if anything, even more accountable.

We would already have become very discouraged had we not known that most other developing countries are in much the same condition. But just knowing that does not make us better servants of the people. It does not address the ineffectiveness of our utilization of development assistance. It does not give us the insight needed to unlock the great potential that exists in broader participation by our citizens in the advancement of their country.

What we do gain from this awareness of similar developmental profiles among developing countries is the realization that many of the fundamental obstacles we are experiencing are probably not attributable to inadequacies unique to us. Thus, through the United Nations initiative on opportunity and participation we are given a powerful new resource to gain an understanding of our difficulties and to chart a more effective course for the future. The work carried out through the initiative will significantly enhance the outcome of the great developmental efforts now under way and will, in particular, go far towards facilitating the fullest possible implementation of Agenda 21.

Paragraph 4 of the draft resolution invites Member States and international organizations to contribute on a voluntary basis towards its implementation. Foreign Minister Kaputin has placed us even more deeply in his country's debt by announcing that Papua New Guinea is making a very generous contribution. The Federated States of Micronesia also wishes to demonstrate its appreciation and support for the initiative and, therefore, at the appropriate time, we will contribute to the voluntary fund a sum that will confirm our recognition of its importance to us.

We join the sponsors of the draft resolution in calling for its adoption by consensus.

Mr. SOEGARDA (Indonesia): Allow me at the outset to express my delegation's sincere appreciation to Mr. John R. Kaputin, the Foreign Minister of Papua New Guinea, for his informative and thought-provoking introductory statement on this agenda item. My delegation believes that all of us here will give it the serious consideration such a proposal on this important issue deserves.

We gather here today to consider this item on the United Nations initiative on opportunity and participation against the backdrop of the international community's relentless search for ways and means to improve the human condition. Such a search is driven by the need to redress the major economic problems confronting the developed and developing countries alike, as well as the need to take advantage of the opportunities and challenges presented by the post-cold-war era.

We therefore believe the time is opportune for initiatives to accelerate development, eradicate poverty and revitalize the global economy. Within that rubric there is a definite movement, both at the conceptual level and with regard to consensus building. The concept of development is increasingly seen as broad based and centred on people, as has been clearly demonstrated at the tenth Summit Meeting of the countries members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries last year and, time and again, by the Group of 77. To this end the South Commission, in its report, "Challenge to the South," has emphasized the priority goal of meeting the basic needs of the majority of the people and a firm commitment to the removal of poverty and hunger. The concept has also evolved to encompass sustainability and is adapting to the provisions of Agenda 21. So too, the International Development Strategy, the Declaration of the eighteenth special session of the General Assembly and the commitments of the eighth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD VIII) have helped to reorient and broaden the concept and indivisibility of the social,

economic and political dimensions of development and make them more fully accepted.

Moreover, the need to achieve people-centred development requires increasing focus on human-resources development and national-capacity building. We believe that each of those aspects of development, among others, should be integrated in the proposed agenda for development. In this context we can appreciate the timeliness and relevance of increased sensitivity to the need to strengthen the availability of opportunities for people in development and their increased participation in charting their own destinies. In that light, and in keeping with the concept of people-centred development, it is important that Governments define their national development strategies so as to embrace the objectives of increased access to opportunity and participation for all people in development.

It is within this framework that my delegation supports the Papua New Guinea proposal to bring its initiative to the attention of the international community. In this vein, we believe that it is essential to make a serious effort to achieve consensus on the draft resolution on the item before us.

The PRESIDENT: I wish to announce that the list of speakers for item 151 is now closed.

Mr. HOROI (Solomon Islands): On behalf of the people and Government of Solomon Islands, I should like to congratulate the Papua New Guinea Government on proposing a United Nations initiative on opportunity and participation.

In line with agreements reached by the Melanesian Spearhead Group, as well as by all members of the South Pacific Forum, we are pleased to offer the proposal our support. As my country's Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs told the General Assembly a month ago, we welcome the Papua New Guinea proposal. Sharing many interests, including needs and aspirations, with the country from which the proposal comes, we are proud to be one of the sponsors of the relevant draft resolution (A/48/L.19).

Having been represented at the Regional Workshop on Opportunity and Participation, we are gratified at the way in which other Members and specialized agencies of the United Nations have adopted the proposal, as well as the theme, as their own.

Like people in other parts of the developing world, many Solomon Islanders are still looking for ways of supplementing, or even replacing, subsistence activities by entering the cash economy for the first time. Others are already much more immediately concerned with increasing the scope, number and diversity of their involvement in income-generating activities. Realization of the commitment to sustainable development made by the people and Government of Solomon Islands means that opportunities for participation must not only grow but be maximized, and, above all, linked.

"Opportunity and Participation" is not just the name of a particular initiative proposed for and by Members of the United Nations. It is a goal to which people in every part of the world aspire, to which Governments state that they are committed, and to which various other bodies, including the United Nations Development Programme, claim to adhere.

In countries like mine, where economic development barely keeps pace with rising population and costs, increasing opportunity and participation is an important key to equity, growth and national self-reliance. The difficulties which lie in the way of attaining such goals are often substantial and quite diverse. They include problems such as traditional land-tenure systems, which prevent resources which the people undoubtedly own from being used in order to raise capital for investment or to secure loans. They extend to legal regimes which do not provide adequately for traditional modes of property ownership or inheritance. They also embrace shortages of relevant education, training and skills. As in other newly independent countries, some of these difficulties have foreign origins. The causes of others are clearly home-grown. What often appears to be lacking is effective access to ideas about means, including the availability of appropriate technology, through which such difficulties can be overcome.

The ad hoc panel on opportunity and participation proposed in the Papua New Guinea draft resolution offers a promising, progressive and, above all, practical approach. If we are to make good use of its findings, then we must maximize them and adopt such approaches and solutions as seem suitable for ourselves. The project is, moreover, one to which I believe that those of us with practical experience of development in Solomon Islands can also make effective and sometimes original contributions to development in our own and other regions.

In reading through the draft resolution, I am pleased to note the sensitivity it displays to the diverse circumstances of different countries. While it focuses on the particular needs of developing countries, it also takes account of others' needs. It adopts what might accurately be described as a genuinely global approach. The draft resolution also displays a welcome awareness of the

financial and other resource constraints which limit the ability of the United Nations to undertake additional responsibilities, even when they are as widely welcomed - and as economical - as the proposed panel study and report on opportunity and participation.

The Papua New Guinea Government's offer to make a special donation to assist in implementing its proposal is to be warmly and highly commended, as is the effort which it has put into ensuring that the proposal fits in with other development-related activities undertaken by the Secretariat and specialized agencies of the United Nations.

The ambitiously close deadline set for completion of the ad hoc panel's task should help to ensure that costs are kept in check. It also means that the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations will - quite appropriately - have something to offer specifically to all who are interested in the problems and prospects of a significant part of the global community: the citizens of developing countries. The proposal allows the United Nations itself to assume credit for the initiative, and this modest approach deserves applause.

The official motto of Solomon Islands is "To lead is to serve". In similar fashion, I would suggest that to participate in the national economy is to contribute to national development - both directly, through purchases of goods and services, and indirectly, in various other ways, including taxation. Maximizing opportunities for participation not only provides for those who are directly involved but sets an example for others to follow, and, if they can, exceed. While openings should be as widely and readily accessible as possible, we cannot always realistically expect uniform or equal outcomes.

The Government of Solomon Islands feels that the emphasis which the United Nations is putting on the human aspects of development is exactly what countries like ours need. We look forward to its elaboration as the work of the proposed ad hoc panel on opportunity and participation proceeds.

I have both the honour and pleasure of stating, on behalf of the people and Government of Solomon Islands, that the proposed United Nations initiative and draft resolution on opportunity and participation enjoy our strong support, and we urge the adoption of the draft resolution by general consensus.

Mr. SENILOLI (Fiji): My delegation wishes to express its strong support for the proposal before the General Assembly today for the implementation of the United Nations initiative on opportunity and participation.

We commend His Excellency The Honourable John Kaputin, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Papua New Guinea, and his Government for the foresight, diligence and commitment they have demonstrated in bringing this initiative to the attention of the Assembly.

We would like to thank, in particular, the Permanent Representative of Papua New Guinea, Ambassador Renagi Renagi Lohia, and his delegation for the background documents that they have provided. Their efforts have certainly been helpful in enriching our understanding of the initiative.

At the same time, we would like to acknowledge the very valuable contribution that the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is making to the international debate and to focusing world attention on increasing opportunities for the participation of people at all levels of development. We are particularly grateful to UNDP for the assistance that it is providing to the countries in our region in the preparation of our regional Pacific human development report.

While the concepts of opportunity and participation may be highly complex, they are nevertheless very relevant to the work the United Nations is doing in its continuing efforts to establish world peace, social progress and better standards of living in larger freedom through genuine international cooperation and participation. The world today is becoming increasingly interdependent and, at the same time, increasingly integrated. Moreover, it is on the verge of a major transition. We must do everything possible to ensure that this globalization will not widen further the ever-increasing gap between the developed and the developing countries.

An equitable system of international order is urgently needed to ensure that developing countries, and especially the smaller nations that are included in this category, do not for ever remain in a position of dependence that could continue to prevent them from effectively participating in important matters affecting them. Due attention needs to be given to increased opportunities for dialogue between developed and developing countries, access to trade, development finance and transfer of technology. In this context of rapid changes in the world social, economic and political situation, we believe that a global initiative such as the one that is currently being mooted is both timely and very necessary.

People everywhere today have an increasing urge to participate fully in all events and processes affecting their lives and living conditions. It is widely recognized that it is only when people set their own goals, develop their own approaches and take their own decisions that human

creativity can best be realized and that the results of development are more likely to be self-sustaining.

The pioneering studies undertaken by UNDP provide a rather gloomy picture of the extent to which people today are able to participate in the decisions that affect their lives and of the opportunity they have to put their capabilities to full use for the betterment of their lives.

Allow me briefly to highlight some basic facts from these studies, as they provide an important backdrop against which we must view our support for this initiative on opportunity and participation.

The *Human Development Report 1993* points out there are more than 1 billion people today living in abject poverty, despite the fact that the world is producing enough food for all of its 5.7 billion people. The richest fifth of the world's population enjoys more than 150 times the income enjoyed by the poorest fifth of the population. The bottom 20 per cent receive only 1.4 per cent of the world's income; it has a share of only 1 per cent in world trade, 0.2 per cent in world commercial lending and 1.3 per cent of world investment.

Furthermore, because of trade restrictions, global markets are denying as much as 500 billion dollars worth of market opportunities every year to developing countries and poor people. This, as we know, is equivalent to almost 10 times more than the foreign assistance the developing nations are receiving. The situation is even more worrisome when widening disparities in higher levels of education, technology and information systems are added to the picture.

Enrolment in tertiary education in the developing countries is only one fifth that of the developed countries. Research and development expenditure is only 4 per cent of that of developed countries and the number of scientific and technical personnel is only one ninth of the number in developed countries. The UNDP report stresses that these widening human development gaps have a telling impact in our world today, where technological progress is taking centre stage and where it now accounts for from one third to one half of the increase in national output.

The report goes on to stress further that the full participation of people in defining their own lives and their own future can be achieved only where non-governmental organizations, entrepreneurs, women, and indeed all people are empowered to take initiative and participate in open markets and effective government, where pluralism prevails, and where human rights and access to information of all types are guaranteed.

My country attaches the utmost importance to the participation of people in all development efforts. Our strategic plan is the blueprint by which we are making all possible efforts to build a society that offers ample opportunities for our people to improve their conditions of life. We are, at the same time, strongly committed to providing community care for those who are less able to help themselves. Our national policies recognize that, when people have the opportunity to work, they are best able to raise their living standards.

We in Fiji are convinced that productive employment gives people a real sense of purpose and self-respect. It enables them to look after themselves and their families. Without growing employment, more and more people will become dependent on government, which, in turn, will then be less able to apply the resources needed for capital investment in the provision of infrastructure to support and generate development activities and in the construction of public utilities such as schools, hospitals, water supply and housing.

While our national policy is critical to increasing opportunity and participation, we believe that efforts at the international level are also of vital importance. Our own efforts alone will not solve this problem. The United Nations initiative on opportunity and participation must, in this context, ensure that an independent and objective assessment of the global social and economic imbalances is undertaken.

We trust that this assessment will be helpful in identifying the difficulties that are being encountered in widening opportunities and participation both within countries and at the international level. We hope the panel of experts that will be appointed will be successful in recommending practical options for increasing and maximizing opportunity and participation.

My delegation appreciates the particular focus that the initiative will give to the concerns of developing countries and to the particular circumstances of the small island countries. We also appreciate the consideration that the initiative will give to the rights of women, children, indigenous people and other disadvantaged groups.

In the preparation of the report, we hope full consideration will be given to the need for more enlightened dialogue on new patterns of development cooperation and on more equitable access to global opportunities, especially in the fields of trade, development finance and technology transfer. The initiative should support and complement the ongoing process initiated by the Secretary-General last year for the preparation of an agenda for development.

In conclusion, I wish to reiterate my delegation's support for the draft resolution on the United Nations initiative on opportunity and participation. We are pleased to be one of its sponsors. My delegation considers this initiative to be fully supportive of the commitment of the United Nations to world peace, freedom and social and economic development, as enshrined in the Charter.

The draft resolution has benefited greatly from the wide consultations that have been undertaken by the delegation of Papua New Guinea in a true spirit of cooperation and compromise, and with the interests of all countries in mind. I hope that this initiative will be a source of inspiration to all of us; my delegation urges all Member States to join in adopting it by consensus.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.

United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
FORTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records

56th PLENARY MEETING
Tuesday, 16 November 1993 at 10 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. INSANALLY (Guyana)

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 46

QUESTION OF THE FALKLAND ISLANDS (MALVINAS)

The PRESIDENT: With regard to this item I wish to call the attention of the General Assembly to document A/48/266, which contains a Joint Statement issued in Buenos Aires and London on 12 July 1993 by the Governments of the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Similarly, taking into account General Assembly decision 47/408 of 10 November 1992, I wish to inform representatives that, following consultations on item 46, "Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)", it is proposed that the Assembly decide to postpone consideration of this item and to include it in the provisional agenda of its forty-ninth session.

May I take it therefore that the General Assembly, taking into account decision 47/408, wishes to take note of document A/48/266, to which I have referred, and that it is also the wish of the General Assembly to postpone consideration of the item and to include it in the provisional agenda of the forty-ninth session?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly has thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 46.

AGENDA ITEM 26

COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE CONFERENCE ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

(a) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/48/549)

(b) DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/48/L.18)

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Sweden to introduce draft resolution A/48/L.18.

Mr. OSVALD (Sweden): I have the honour to speak both in my capacity as Permanent Representative of Sweden and as representative of the Chairman-in-Office of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE).

It is my pleasure to introduce draft resolution A/48/L.18 on Cooperation between the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Before I continue my statement I wish to make two announcements.

First, to the list of sponsors in the printed version of the draft resolution, the following names should be added: Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Liechtenstein, Malta, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovenia, Spain, Tajikistan, Turkey, Ukraine and the United States of America.

I also wish to announce that in the English version of the draft resolution, in the third preambular paragraph, there is a typing error. Reference is made to Chapter VII

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, Room C-178, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

93-87189 (E)

Distr. GENERAL

A/48/PV.56
26 November 1993

ENGLISH

of the Charter. That should be Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations.

This draft resolution is one reflection of the need jointly to develop the elements of what has been called interlocking institutions of European security. The challenges ahead, the new possibilities given and the complex problems we are facing in the CSCE region require us to adjust old structures and interrelationships and complement them with new initiatives.

When Sweden assumed responsibility as Chairman of the CSCE one year ago the central task was to develop the CSCE as an instrument in the quest for peace. We therefore wanted to consolidate the community of values, we wanted to put emphasis on preventive diplomacy and crisis management, and we wanted to improve cooperation with other international organizations and continue to strengthen CSCE structures.

The role of the CSCE as an instrument for conflict prevention and resolution makes increased cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and the CSCE not only desirable but necessary. Pragmatic and effective work in the field is necessary in order to prevent conflicts from arising or at least from turning into armed ones and to contribute to the resolution of ongoing conflicts.

It is in this spirit that Sweden during its tenure as Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE has sought to assist in finding new ways for this concrete cooperation. The framework for cooperation and coordination between the United Nations Secretariat and the CSCE that was signed in May this year by the Secretary-General and the Chairman of the CSCE Council, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Sweden, is therefore an important expression of the continuing development of our relations.

The recent decision by the Assembly to grant observer status to the CSCE will also enable us to develop closer ties between the two organizations to the benefit of the development of cooperation in the long run and facilitating our daily work. This arrangement also means that the Secretary-General of the CSCE, Mr. Wilhelm Höynck, will today address this Assembly for the first time.

Political support from the United Nations, not least from the Security Council, to CSCE activities is an essential contribution to United Nations-CSCE cooperation and in particular to concrete conflict resolution activities. The CSCE is consequently developing the means to provide relevant information and support to the United Nations and its decision-making bodies through appropriate channels. Interaction between the CSCE and the Security Council enhances a common strategy for common purposes.

In accordance with the framework on cooperation and coordination the two sides now hold consultations on a regular basis and uphold the frequent exchange of information on relevant issues. Furthermore, close contact is maintained with developments in each specific undertaking in order to ensure coordination and complementarity and to avoid duplication. Consultation on joint missions and examination of the possibility of joint reports are other important parts of the cooperation under way.

The need for mutual assistance in the field is an important element of the framework. Cooperation on the ground is of course essential and much time and effort have been invested in order to find ways to implement this provision in various conflict areas.

Cooperation and coordination have just started. More could and should be done. In the field, as well as between headquarters, political will should be transformed into cooperative action.

When discussing cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE, it is important to bear in mind that the two organizations have different competences and different comparative advantages. Mutual support and coordination should therefore, in our mind, be the guiding principles for such cooperation.

In practice, this cooperation and coordination can take and are taking different forms: in one conflict the two organizations might each tackle separate but coordinated tasks, while in another, one of them might take the lead, relying on political back-up from the other.

This concept, aimed at a common strategy, flexibility and the avoidance of duplication of work, is well described in numerous resolutions and statements issued by this Assembly, by the Security Council, and by the Secretary-General in his report "An Agenda for Peace" (A/47/277).

I would especially like to draw attention to the statement made by the Security Council on 28 January 1993 inviting regional arrangements to study ways and means of further improving the coordination of their efforts with those of the United Nations. The Council stressed that this interaction should be flexible and adequate to each specific situation.

Allow me to give a few examples of the way in which this flexibility is carried out by the CSCE and the United Nations in the CSCE region.

Let me first mention the importance the CSCE attaches to the implementation of the United Nations

sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro). The coordinating role played by the CSCE, together with the European Community, in monitoring the sanctions should be regarded as an active and effective contribution to the world community's efforts to come to grips with the tragic situation in the former Yugoslavia.

The CSCE is also preparing to take an active part in a comprehensive restructuring and rehabilitation programme in former Yugoslavia, to be implemented as soon as a peace agreement is reached.

In The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the long-term spillover mission of the CSCE and the UNPROFOR/Macedonia command are cooperating closely to achieve their common goal of preventing the conflict in former Yugoslavia from spreading to that Republic.

In Georgia, the efforts of the United Nations and the CSCE are increasingly coordinated, on the ground as well as in the ongoing endeavours to find a peaceful settlement of the conflicts. The invitation to the CSCE to participate in the future peace talks on Abkhazia organized by the United Nations, and vice versa on South Ossetia, are important steps. Mutual liaison in observer missions is a possibility to be considered.

In Tajikistan, the United Nations and the CSCE can in joint action play mutually supporting roles in trying to help that country emerge from its present plight.

The efforts to find a peaceful solution to the conflict in and around Nagorny Karabakh within the CSCE Minsk process is being strengthened by political support from the Security Council, manifested once again last week with the adoption of resolution 884 (1993).

A trilateral discussion on cooperation between the United Nations, the CSCE and the Council of Europe regarding human rights and the human dimension was initiated by the CSCE this summer with the aim of promoting human rights and democratic values.

It is a great challenge, for both the United Nations and the CSCE, to try to develop new forms of cooperation and coordination in this volatile period in the CSCE region. The General Assembly can make a contribution to this work here today by unanimously adopting draft resolution A/48/L.18.

Mr. SHUSTOV (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): First of all, I would like say that we share the hope of the representative of Sweden that draft resolution A/48/L.18, which we are discussing, will be adopted unanimously. On behalf of my own delegation, I hope we will act in this fashion because what is being discussed here today will be discussed in Vienna on Thursday at the Vienna Forum of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE).

The Russian Federation believes in the development of close and multifaceted cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE. We view the CSCE as the leading pan-European organization, one which plays a priority role with respect to other European associations. We are convinced that the CSCE is an institution that plays a unique role in the strengthening of security and stability on the European continent and in the Asian countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), and in the prevention and settlement of ethnic and other conflicts. The Russian Federation believes in the active development of collective mechanisms to be used by the CSCE for the prevention and settlement of crises and for a substantial increase in its peace-keeping potential; we feel that this young international organization should be able to make more active use of the experience, both positive and negative, accumulated by the United Nations in conducting peace-keeping operations.

The Russian Federation believes that mutual support and interaction in promoting peace and stability should become the central element of cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE. At the same time, it seems quite important that the role and potential of the United Nations Security Council will increase as a result of the development of active cooperation with the growing potential of the CSCE.

It is also our belief that the CSCE, as a regional agreement in the sense of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter, is the major partner of the United Nations in the area of peace-keeping in the European and Atlantic region. That is why we will, together with other member States of the CSCE, continue in our efforts to strengthen the legal and organizational basis of the CSCE as a regional association. We hope the time will come when the CSCE will change its name from the "Conference" to the "Organization" on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

In this area, we have already taken some important steps, and on behalf of my delegation I would like to follow the representative of Sweden in welcoming here to this meeting of the General Assembly the Secretary-General of the CSCE, Ambassador Wilhelm Höynck.

The experience of peacemaking activities in former Yugoslavia, Nagorny Karabakh, Abkhazia, South Ossetia, Transnistria and other conflict areas has shown that the efficiency of the efforts of members of the international

community depends largely on the measure of coordination and the sharing of responsibility between different international and regional structures.

In this process, it is important to act gradually and realistically. A simplistic and one-sided approach is out of place. Experience has shown that the combination of efforts by regional organizations with United Nations activities must be flexible and must correspond to specific situations.

For that reason, without diminishing the importance of other issues, it is important to pay particular attention to a rational distribution of functions between the United Nations and the CSCE in their anti-crisis actions.

The Russian delegation believes that the CSCE could assume more solid political responsibility for peace-keeping activities within its geographic zone. We would welcome the eventual broader competence and structural reinforcement of the CSCE in decision-making and planning, and in conducting peace-keeping operations and exercising control over them. At the same time, the present concept of CSCE peace-keeping activities continues to impose certain limitations that exclude the elements of peace enforcement. However, at this stage it may actually be an advantage in terms of a division of labour between the two organizations.

It would be appropriate to focus the interaction between the United Nations and the CSCE in the area of peace-keeping on establishing a dialogue on doctrinal aspects and the exchange of information, and on conducting joint actions, including the establishment of joint United Nations-CSCE missions - for example, observation or fact-finding missions. In addition, it would be appropriate to provide both for the possibility of including individual representatives of one of the organizations in the missions of the other and for the establishment of full-fledged joint missions with a single mandate and under common leadership. At the same time, the Security Council in its resolutions could confirm and support the decisions of the CSCE and also give instructions to the CSCE, which is a regional organization.

The issue of cooperation between the CSCE and the United Nations in mutually ensuring the security of mission personnel is becoming ever more topical. This idea could be implemented in practice at this stage through, for example, the conclusion of an agreement between the United Nations forces stationed in the territory of The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the CSCE mission deployed there on the inclusion of CSCE representatives in United Nations evacuation plans in case of emergencies.

In our view, it would be advisable for the CSCE in coming years to consolidate its orientation towards early warning and the use of preventive political and diplomatic means of influence, without trying, for the time being, to create within its framework the material base for peace-keeping operations. The task of the CSCE should consist first of all in detecting, localizing and seeking to avert crises, establishing a dialogue between parties in conflict, and ensuring observance of cease-fires.

The CSCE could consider the specific issue of assuming certain responsibilities in post-crisis settlement in the former Yugoslavia, thus supplementing the efforts of the European Community and releasing the United Nations from its long-standing involvement in the rehabilitation of this region. I must say that a very interesting proposal in this regard was submitted to the CSCE by the delegation of Sweden. Incidentally, this could be a gesture towards those countries that have shown concern about the particular attention apparently paid by the United Nations to the Yugoslav crisis.

We are just beginning to comprehend the issue of the rational distribution of responsibilities between the United Nations and the CSCE in the settlement of crises and conflicts throughout the territory of the Commonwealth of Independent States. It may be precisely in this area that we should test by practical experience the idea of joint United Nations-CSCE missions. To start, we could try to apply this idea in Tajikistan. Such a mission could, in particular, promote dialogue between the Government and the opposition, contribute to the solution of the refugee problem and launch the development of guarantees of the rights of all ethnic groups.

In the context of possible interaction between the United Nations and the CSCE in the area of early warning, ideas have been put forth concerning the establishment, under the auspices of the CSCE, of its own peace-keeping forces along the lines of the future stand-by forces of the United Nations. In our opinion, we could discuss at this stage a formula for joint use of the future stand-by forces on the understanding that the United Nations could promote the use for CSCE purposes of contingents that were idle at any given moment. At any rate, all these ideas deserve to be discussed by the United Nations and the CSCE.

Peace-keeping, which I have discussed in some detail, is the central but not the only sphere of cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE. There is a perceived need to develop closer links between the CSCE Warsaw Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights and the United Nations Centre for Human Rights, in particular to ensure a more rapid exchange of

information between them. Such cooperation will undoubtedly stimulate the activities of both organizations in the establishment of democratic values and human rights.

We feel that the strengthening of interaction between the CSCE Economic Forum and the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe - with a view to providing assistance to CSCE member States in carrying out their economic reforms - also has good prospects.

The establishment of a regular exchange of opinions and information between the United Nations Secretary-General and the Chairman-in-Office of the Council of the CSCE, as well as the CSCE Secretary-General as the representative of the Chairman-in-Office, has acquired a great importance. In this connection, we attach particular importance to the document entitled "Framework for cooperation and coordination between the United Nations Secretariat and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe". We hope that the provisions contained in this document will be further developed.

We are certain that the adoption by the General Assembly at its forty-eighth session of the draft resolution entitled "Cooperation between the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe" and co-sponsored by the Russian Federation, will, as the Ambassador of Sweden has said, lend new impetus to the strengthening of interaction between these two organizations.

In conclusion, I would like to stress that the discussion of this problem in the General Assembly is of great practical importance, since it is taking place on the eve of the meeting in Rome of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the 53 CSCE member States, which will serve as an important landmark in the development of the CSCE as an effective international organization. On behalf of our delegation, I should like to ask the Secretary-General, Mr. Höynk, to report to the Vienna Forum of the CSCE on the discussion of the draft resolution at the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly.

Mr. BOTEZ (Romania) *(interpretation from French)*: The formal coordination of the activities of the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) is a new subject that undoubtedly deserves to be inscribed on the evolving agenda of the General Assembly.

However, I feel that in fact such coordination did not begin with the adoption by the General Assembly at its last session of resolution 47/10, which opens the chapter of institutional contacts and joint action. Rather, it seems to me that this resolution gives formal expression to a structure that has been coming into closer harmony since the mid-1970s, when first the spirit and then the process which we have come to call the "Helsinki" spirit and process were established in the geographical space that generated the two major conflagrations of this century. I believe that the world today cannot be understood in isolation from the history of the harmonization between the United Nations and the CSCE.

Indeed, the international situation following the end of the cold war gives us a different view of the past. To cite Borges, every great writer discovers or even invents a line of predecessors that justifies him. In today's world we understand even better than we did in 1975 the importance of the United Nations and the Helsinki process for the Europe today and for mankind as a whole. From among the ills of recent decades, it is their spirit that should be kept as the precursor of the realities of 1993. But this new reading of history also suggests a sort of distribution of roles which was not noticed in the past but which can, I believe, be sustained from our present viewpoint.

I would say, at the risk of didactic oversimplification, that, at least for us in Europe, the United Nations and the Helsinki Conference play complementary roles. In the United Nations the main issue was safeguarding peace, in an attempt to reduce as much as possible the risk of confrontation between States or groups of States. We could thus speak of a scope embracing external, international structures of peace and security. In our view at least, the Helsinki spirit also related to internal or intra-national structures of peace and security. There is no need to repeat that respect for human rights in prosperous and stable democracies diminishes the risk of confrontation.

Allow me, as a representative of a country that slumbered under dictatorship for almost half a century, to mention here, for example, the immense role played by the famous "third basket" concerning human rights for the protection of anti-totalitarian dissent and for the development of civilian society in Central and Eastern Europe, phenomena in the absence of which the anti-communist revolutions of 1989 cannot be explained. "Solidarnose" in Poland, Charter 77 in Czechoslovakia and the Free Trade Union in Romania, to give but a few examples, are all expressions of the Helsinki spirit, and the new Europe remains extremely grateful to those who embarked on and followed up this process.

The collapse of communism in Central and Eastern Europe opened up a new chapter in the history of the United Nations, in the evolution of the spirit and process of Helsinki, and also in their possible relationships. The

United Nations, hindered for decades by the cold war, can finally begin to shoulder its planetary responsibilities.

The Helsinki process has also gathered new momentum. Differences between external and internal structures of peace seem to be disappearing in a Europe where dictatorship has disappeared and where, theoretically, at least, pluralistic democracy and market economies have triumphed. Even more clearly than before, the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) must be seen as different political expressions of the same spirit, marked by understanding, diversity and cooperation. At the Helsinki Summit in July 1992, participating States declared that the CSCE was a regional arrangement in the sense of the United Nations Charter and that as such it provided an important link between European and global security. The cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE and with any other regional structure is on two essential levels: first, a conceptual and theoretical level where an attempt is made to define the fundamental political meaning of such cooperation and, secondly, a level of means and practical action, from a pragmatic and operational perspective.

Theoretically, the scope of the possibilities for cooperation is remarkable. Suffice it to mention here the potential of regional organizations in the discharge of functions such as preventive diplomacy, the maintenance of peace, the restoration of peace and the consolidation of stability and peace after conflicts, as pointed out in the excellent report "An Agenda for Peace" of His Excellency the Secretary-General, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali. But this theoretical scope of cooperation must be explored and utilized. Our task here is that of creating the institutional framework for such action.

From the standpoint of means and practical actions, the Secretary-General's report (A/48/549) of 2 November 1993 on cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE paints a stimulating and promising picture. Suffice it to mention by way of example the determination and promptness with which the CSCE, upon the request of the Republic of Moldova and in coordination with the United Nations, got involved in the settlement of the grave situation facing the Government of the Republic of Moldova in the eastern part of the country, where the troops of a foreign army are still to be found.

As we can all see, cooperation and interaction between the United Nations and the CSCE is under way. In resolution 48/5 the CSCE was granted observer status in the United Nations General Assembly. The exchange of letters, in May 1993, between the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Chairman-in-Office of the Council of the CSCE was also a significant step in this cooperation. It is a duty, not merely an honour and a pleasure, to pay a special tribute here to the Secretary-General, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, and Mrs. Margaretha af Ugglas, Foreign Minister of Sweden and current Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE, for their personal contribution to this process.

In the present era, saturated with holistic, systemic and globalistic approaches, there is no longer any need to repeat that the whole is not merely the mechanical sum of its parts and that the part is not reducible to a mere fragment of the whole. The world as a whole, which is the scope of the United Nations, and Europe, or the Euro-Atlantic space, on which the CSCE focuses, cannot, hence, be seen from the standpoint of simple inclusion, as a mathematician might say. There exists a globalist spirit and a European or Euro-Atlantic spirit. There is a new awareness, evolved over recent decades, that makes it possible to understand that peoples, countries and regions can be and remain different without any loss of pride or standing. This prospect of tolerant globalization and constructive regionalization must, I believe, dominate relations between the United Nations and the CSCE. With this approach their cooperation becomes a project to be defined rather than a decision to be taken.

It is often said that for a problem to be solved it must first be correctly formulated. But it is a commonplace that, particularly in the world of politics, the formulation of problems is the domain of dialogue. Draft resolution A/48/L.18, prepared with remarkable diligence by the Swedish delegation, assures us that such a dialogue will continue next year. As a sponsor of this draft resolution, we express the hope that it will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. SUCHARIPA (Austria): Austria fully concurs with the Secretary-General's view, expressed in "An Agenda for Peace", that

> "regional arrangements ... in many cases possess a potential that should be utilized". *(A/47/277, para. 64)*

Over the last year we have witnessed a considerable increase in cooperation between the United Nations and regional arrangements such as the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the Organization of American States (OAS) and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). This positive trend finally brought about an implementation of the principle of complementarity, which is, of course, an underlying idea of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter.

The participating States of the CSCE reaffirmed in the Final Act signed at Helsinki in 1975 their

> "full and active support for the United Nations and for the enhancement of its role and effectiveness in strengthening international peace, security and justice". *(CSCE, Final Act, 1975, "Declaration on principles guiding relations between participating States", third preambular paragraph)*

They also explicitly declared at the Helsinki Summit in 1992 that the CSCE is a regional arrangement in the spirit of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter, and, as such, that it provides an important link between European and global security.

Consequently, last year, in resolution 47/10, the General Assembly had already stressed the need for enhanced cooperation and coordination between the CSCE and the United Nations. A month ago, it granted observer status to the CSCE with the adoption of resolution 48/5. We therefore have the pleasure today to welcome Ambassador Höynck, Secretary-General of the CSCE, as observer.

Free of regulatory restrictions, the CSCE has been able in a relatively short period of time to elaborate a comprehensive set of political instruments for conflict prevention and conflict resolution. Those already applied in practice have proven to be extremely successful, as CSCE missions in crisis areas have shown. They operate on the basis of flexible mandates covering political, military and human rights issues.

Let me just mention some examples and how they relate to various United Nations efforts: the CSCE has deployed missions of long duration in Kosovo, Sandjak and Vojvodina, in areas of conflict or potential conflict in former Yugoslavia, where the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) is not deployed. The very presence and activities of these missions had a positive effect on developments there; Austria was glad to have been able to participate in those missions. The Belgrade authorities, however, refused to extend the protocol agreement authorizing the deployment of the missions, thereby, *de facto*, ending their activities. In response to that act, the Security Council adopted its resolution 855 (1993), requesting the Belgrade authorities to reconsider their position and to cooperate with the CSCE. Unfortunately, this has not been done to date.

Furthermore, the CSCE has assisted the neighbouring States of Serbia and Montenegro in monitoring the observance of sanctions imposed by the Security Council. In this regard, cooperation with the relevant unit of the United Nations Secretariat is vital.

The Security Council has on a number of occasions supported the efforts of the CSCE, and in particular the Minsk Group, to achieve a peaceful settlement of the conflict in and around the Nagorny Karabakh region of the Azerbaijani Republic. In this case as in some others, the CSCE is taking the lead role according to an agreed distribution of tasks between itself and the United Nations.

Cooperation on the ground between missions of both the United Nations and the CSCE has begun in Georgia and Tajikistan. We are aware of the complex situations there and hope that the practical contacts between the United Nations and the CSCE missions will soon be strengthened and will lead to full cooperation.

These concrete examples clearly show the increasing importance of enhancing cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and the CSCE. Austria therefore welcomes the exchange of letters of 26 May 1993 between the Secretary-General and the Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE Council, which provides a framework for cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and the CSCE. In those letters the two sides agreed to maintain close contact to ensure coordination, complementarity and mutual support, and to avoid possible duplication in the planning and carrying out of activities. In order to achieve these aims, consultations and contacts on a daily basis are necessary. Let me take this opportunity to pay a tribute to Ambassador Peter Osvald, Permanent Representative of the Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE, Sweden, whose Mission has pursued the implementation of the framework in an exemplary manner.

However, increasing the practical implementation of cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE will not be possible without having a United Nations liaison mechanism to the CSCE at the site of most of its bodies, Vienna. The framework set out in the exchange of letters explicitly mentions three points of contact in Vienna: the delegation of the State holding the office of Chairman, the CSCE Secretary-General and other CSCE institutions in Vienna, such as the Conflict Prevention Centre. The current developments, in particular the rapidly increasing activities of the CSCE and the henceforth permanent meetings of the relevant CSCE bodies, first and foremost the Committee of Senior Officials - the Vienna Group - clearly necessitate creating such a liaison mechanism between the United Nations and the CSCE in Vienna. Given the presence of various units and services of the United Nations Secretariat in Vienna, such a step should not provide any administrative problems.

While we welcome the growing cooperation, we see room for improvement and a vast potential for intensification to the benefit of all interested parties.

Austria firmly believes that cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and the CSCE in the interest of peace and security should be further enhanced and developed.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to propose that the list of speakers in the debate on this item be closed now. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly agrees to that proposal.

It was so decided.

Mr. HUSLID (Norway): Norway welcomes the report of the Secretary-General on cooperation between the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). The need for enhanced cooperation and coordination has been stressed ever since the CSCE summit meeting took place in Helsinki 16 months ago.

The exchange of letters of 26 May between the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE on the arrangements for cooperation and coordination established a framework for common approaches. The decision of 13 October to grant the CSCE observer status in the General Assembly strengthens further the basis for increasingly close cooperation and coordination.

The decisions of the Helsinki meeting defined an important CSCE role in early warning, conflict prevention and crisis management. That role has been filled, through concrete actions in conflict areas as well as areas of tension involving national minority issues that have the potential to develop into a conflict. Seven CSCE missions have been dispatched to areas of the former Yugoslavia and the former Soviet Union, and a peace-keeping operation has been prepared for Nagorny Karabakh.

The High Commissioner on National Minorities plays an important role in early warning. We consider that his activities have been very useful and important. However, there is scope for increasing the effectiveness of the CSCE's own activities. The CSCE has also an indisputable potential for assisting the United Nations in carrying out United Nations decisions on several important issues ranging from human rights to conflict prevention.

It is stated in the CSCE Helsinki decisions that the CSCE is a regional arrangement in the sense of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter and as such provides an important link between European and global security. It is worth emphasizing that cooperative security can only be built on complementarity and improved interaction among all the relevant international organizations. Progress has been made towards this end, but more should and can be done. Rivalry must be avoided here, and a pragmatic approach is necessary. There are really enough tasks for everybody.

The new tasks before the CSCE require enhanced practical coordination and cooperation with the United Nations. This is particularly important in conflict areas where both the CSCE and the United Nations have a presence, as in Georgia, Nagorny Karabakh and Tajikistan. The activities in those areas should be coordinated in order to be mutually reinforcing, and it is important to avoid duplication in planning activities.

While the United Nations has a responsibility for global security, the CSCE has a particular responsibility for the security and stability of Europe. We therefore find it useful that the CSCE and the United Nations consult prior to any decision on establishing new missions in the CSCE area. The aim of such consultation should be to obtain a division of labour that would benefit all parties. The first question to be raised is which of the two organizations is best suited to establish a mission.

Norway would like to emphasize that this should be a continuous process. Formal arrangements for mutual exchange of information should be supplemented by informal contacts as part of the normal working routines of the CSCE and the United Nations personnel involved in matters of common concern. At the same time, the dialogue between the Secretary-General and the Chairman-in-Office should continue on a regular basis. We are convinced that this would result in increased efficiency and a wider capacity for addressing new challenges. Frequent contacts at all levels would facilitate a pragmatic division of labour in each case.

I conclude by stating that Norway supports the draft resolution on cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE.

Mr. BROUHNS (Belgium) *(interpretation from French)*: I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union on the question of cooperation between the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). I should like to welcome the presence among us of the CSCE Secretary-General, Ambassador Wilhelm Höynck.

At the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly we welcomed the inclusion of this new item on its agenda. Today we reiterate our support for the consideration of this item, which has recently taken on even greater importance.

The CSCE, which emerged from the cold war, must today take up new challenges, including the resurgence of nationalism, ethnic conflicts, intolerance and xenophobia. The CSCE's approach to those challenges is based on a comprehensive concept of security, that concept establishes a relationship between the maintenance of peace and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It creates a link between cooperation in the fields of the economy and the environment, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, peaceful relations between States. This comprehensive concept is the basis of the CSCE's preventive diplomacy.

Moreover, the CSCE has now acquired new instruments. The powers of the Council and of the Committee of Senior Officials have been strengthened, enabling them, for example, to dispatch missions to crisis regions. The establishment of the office of CSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities has helped to strengthen the CSCE's capacity to avert tension and potential conflict. Lastly, the CSCE now has peace-keeping tools, such as the deployment of observation and monitoring missions in conflict zones. In that connection, we welcome the forthcoming meeting of the CSCE ministerial Council, to be held on 30 November and 1 December in Rome, where the mechanisms and structures of the CSCE are to be further strengthened.

At the end of the Helsinki Summit last July, the Heads of State and Government of the CSCE declared their understanding that the CSCE was a regional arrangement in the sense of Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations. That declaration opened the way towards greater cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE, which the Secretary-General of the United Nations welcomed in his report, "An Agenda for Peace."

In the past few months cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE has been demonstrated in various crises. In support of United Nations efforts in the former Yugoslavia the CSCE has deployed long-term missions in Kosovo, Sandjak, Vojvodina and The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. It has also assisted in investigations of human rights violations, *inter alia*, by sending in 1992 a mission to investigate human rights violations and to examine living conditions in detention camps. It has also assisted neighbouring States to monitor compliance with Security Council sanctions.

In other crises the CSCE, with United Nations support, has become the principal mediator, particularly concerning the conflict in Nagorny Karabakh, with regard to which the Security Council has several times called upon the parties to resume negotiations within the context of the Minsk Group peace process.

While cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE in conflict prevention and resolution has been strengthened, we should also emphasize cooperation with the Commission on Human Rights in the human-rights field; with the Economic Commission for Europe with regard to the economy and the environment; and with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees with regard to refugees and minorities.

•

Exchange of information between the CSCE and the United Nations is already well established. The Secretary-General is represented at meetings of the Committee of Senior Officials and will be sending a representative to the Rome Council meeting. There is also a regular exchange of information between the Mission of the CSCE Chairman-in-Office in New York and the United Nations Secretariat. In this connection, we welcome the efforts of the Swedish Chairman-in-Office, and we trust that contacts will become even stronger in future.

Mrs. Fritsche (Liechtenstein), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The examples I have given only illustrate the growing cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE. This cooperation should be strengthened in future. To that end, Mrs. Af Ugglas, the Swedish Foreign Minister and Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE, had an exchange of letters with the Secretary-General of the United Nations last May with a view to establishing a framework for cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and the CSCE. On 30 October last the General Assembly adopted a resolution inviting the CSCE to participate in its work as an Observer.

In view of the complexity and diversity of the questions that confront and will in future confront the United Nations and the CSCE, cooperation and coordination between them will have based more on pragmatism than on a rigid framework of principles, which could very quickly prove to be inadequate. The goal of maintaining peace in the CSCE region cannot but benefit from greater cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE, which can in turn gain from a flexible synergy of each organization's experience, competence, and means of action. We trust there will be more active cooperation and coordination on the ground. Where the situation justifies it, this could involve appointing someone to represent both the United Nations and the CSCE.

Fully aware of the contribution that can be made to global stability, the European Union encourages this cooperation and welcomes the debate now taking place in the General Assembly on this item.

Mr. BREITENSTEIN (Finland): Last year Finland co-sponsored the draft resolution which initiated the cooperation between the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). This year the General Assembly has taken a step further as it has unanimously invited the CSCE to participate in the Assembly's sessions and work as an Observer.

We welcome this development. The capacity of the United Nations for action in conflict prevention and in crisis management has for some time been stretched to the limit. It is therefore both necessary and natural that the potential of other institutions should be used whenever possible. Recognizing this, the leaders of the States participating in the CSCE decided at the Helsinki Summit in 1992 that the CSCE should be considered a regional arrangement in the meaning of Chapter VIII of the Charter. This decision is fully in conformity with the concept of mutually supportive roles for the United Nations and regional organizations as set out in the Secretary-General's report "An Agenda for Peace" (A/47/277). The CSCE is indeed a natural partner for cooperation with the United Nations.

During the past year cooperation and coordination of activities between the United Nations and the CSCE have been initiated in several conflict areas. Useful experience has already been gained for instance in Abkhazia and South Ossetia, where the United Nations and the CSCE both have missions. A de facto division of labour has emerged between the United Nations and the CSCE in other conflict areas as well. The United Nations has the lead in Tajikistan, where CSCE involvement is under consideration. The CSCE plays a leading role in the attempts to settle the conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan over Nagorny Karabakh. It is also involved in Moldova.

Furthermore, in the Framework for cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and the CSCE it was agreed that the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE should hold consultations on a regular basis on activities of common interest. It is understandable that it will take some time for the practical forms of this cooperation to evolve and develop. The missions in Georgia show us how important it is to achieve good and effective cooperation. Conflicts of interest and duplication of work should, and can, be avoided through a good working relationship between the missions. Where difficulties occur, they can certainly be overcome through mutual efforts and good will. It is also imperative that the respective missions present a harmonious and united image to the local population; otherwise we risk losing credibility. This should not be difficult, as the work of the United Nations and that of the CSCE reinforce each other and have the same goals.

The challenges which local and regional conflicts in the CSCE area pose are, unfortunately, enormous. These challenges must be met. In this, coordinated efforts by the United Nations, the CSCE and other European and transatlantic institutions are needed.

The Government of Finland wholeheartedly supports the further development of cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and the CSCE. The present Framework agreement provides a good basis for this. Additional efforts by both institutions are, however, needed if we want to be able to respond to the growing challenges.

Mr. FULCI (Italy): Two weeks from today, during the ministerial Council in Rome, Italy will assume the chairmanship of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). That is why I am speaking after our Belgian colleague, who made a statement on behalf of the European Union with which we of course entirely agree.

In the year of its chairmanship of the CSCE, Italy intends fully to play the political role which is assigned to the Chairman by CSCE documents and which includes representing the CSCE in other countries and organizations. In this context, we will work for closer and more regular ties between the CSCE and other international organizations, particularly the United Nations. All 53 States members of the CSCE recognize the need for stronger ties with the United Nations, whose increasing role in the management of international crises has led it into areas where the CSCE too has been forced to step up its engagement.

So far, the CSCE's efforts to achieve cooperation with the United Nations have followed two basic guidelines: first, achieving agreements on the mechanism for collaboration between the United Nations and the CSCE; and, secondly, obtaining observer status for the CSCE in the United Nations in order that it may participate in the proceedings of the General Assembly. New points of contact have been established in New York, Geneva and Vienna through the missions of the rotating chairmanship of the CSCE.

This course of action has produced the outcome that we hoped for, thanks in particular to the energetic work of the Swedish delegation to the United Nations under the leadership of our colleague Peter Osvald, to whom I wish to extend my warmest appreciation.

Thus began a deeper understanding of the respective activities of the United Nations and the CSCE, and a more concrete relationship. The first results of these efforts can be seen in the understanding reached between the United Nations and the CSCE on The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, as well as in the decision last April 28 by the Committee of Senior Officials to begin negotiating an agreement on mutual cooperation in Georgia.

As the next Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE, Italy aims to further explore all the possibilities, not only for cooperation between our two organizations but for a true coordination of their respective activities.

It is our intention, first of all, to implement all the measures provided by the framework which has been set up between the United Nations and the CSCE. Duplication of activities and gaps should be prevented as much as possible. The same applies to utilization of resources, which, as we know only too well, are always limited. On a purely pragmatic basis, the two organizations could even alternate leading and supporting roles in certain peace initiatives. Above all, we must take advantage of the potential synergy between the two organizations. We intend to promote and further develop this cooperation in a way appropriate to varying circumstances, in the framework of preventive diplomacy, which in our view is and must remain the CSCE's primary vocation.

It is our opinion that a greater, more harmonious political and organizational relationship between the United Nations and the CSCE could become a fundamental asset in defining a response to tensions and conflicts in the CSCE area. Concrete cooperation between the two organizations has already begun. Let me also cite a few cases, some of which have already been mentioned by previous speakers: in the former Yugoslavia, through the long-term missions to Kosovo, Sandjak, and Vojvodina mandated by Security Council resolution 855 (1993); through the Corell Mission to assess the human-rights situation in Croatia and Bosnia, which contributed to the establishment of the International Tribunal in resolution 808 (1993); through Sanction Advisory Missions, which guarantee application of the measures imposed by Security Council resolutions 757 (1992) and 820 (1993); in Nagorny Karabakh, where the work of the CSCE's Minsk Group has met the full encouragement and support of the Security Council; and in Georgia and Tajikistan, where the situation on the ground suggests that the CSCE and the United Nations can and should join forces.

We believe that these opportunities should be further studied, clarified and developed. The fact that the CSCE is a regional organization, as provided for by Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter, carries both definite privileges and inescapable burdens. Italy is well aware of this and will do everything possible to consolidate this cooperation. We are fully confident that our United Nations interlocutors in New York, Geneva and Vienna, and in the specific contexts of regional crises in the CSCE area, will share this approach.

Mr. BATIOUK (Ukraine): Ukraine willingly supports the welcome trend towards closer cooperation and interaction between the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) in all fields of mutual interest - first and foremost in those relating to conflict prevention and conflict resolution, as well as to protection and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Proceeding from this stand, Ukraine, as a participant of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, supported the statement of the participating States of the 1992 CSCE Helsinki Summit, which declared that the CSCE is a regional arrangement in the sense of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter.

While considering the security of Ukraine inseparable from that of all its neighbours, Ukraine stands for the establishment of a reliable all-European system of collective security wherein the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe plays a crucial role. In this regard, we welcome the agreement reached between the United Nations Secretary-General and the CSCE Council's Chairman-in-Office on the framework of cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and the CSCE. In our view, the interaction envisaged by this agreement should enhance the efficiency of peacemaking efforts by the international community in the conflict areas of the CSCE region and, at the same time, avoid unnecessary and costly overlapping or duplication in these activities. A closer cooperation between the two organizations will also promote the regular exchange of information between the United Nations and the CSCE, especially in the fields of early warning and prevention of conflicts, as well as at the stage of their resolution.

All peace-keeping and peacemaking activities should be of a truly international character and must be carried out in strict accordance with the United Nations Charter and the fundamental CSCE documents. We oppose yielding to any State's claims for providing it with special powers from the United Nations or the CSCE in the field of maintaining or restoring peace in any region or subregion of the world or of Europe. In accordance with the United Nations Charter and the CSCE documents, the mandate for peace-keeping operations must be endorsed case by case and only at the official request of the Government of the State whose territory becomes the scene of those operations. Ukraine believes it advisable to refrain from involving in peace-keeping operations countries which are

known to be able to use their participation in peace-keeping activities for consolidating or imposing their political, economic or military interests in the region.

Current realities make it necessary to maintain close contact between the United Nations and the CSCE in carrying out various missions, ensuring their interaction and the exchange of results derived from their activities. We envisage and invite the possibility of joint missions, if need be. In our opinion, the joint participation of representatives and experts in relevant conferences and forums held within the framework of the United Nations and the CSCE is essential.

We believe that the present arrangement on cooperation and interaction between the United Nations and the CSCE in the field of preventing and resolving conflicts is but the first step towards solving today's most pressing and urgent problems. That first step must be followed by additional ones which would expand this cooperation to new and important fields. In particular, it is worth examining the possibility of establishing closer ties between the United Nations and the CSCE in all spheres of human activity.

The consequences of the recently aggravated problem of forced migration and the influx of refugees constitute a serious challenge to security and stability in Europe. None of the CSCE participating States is able, alone, to cope with streams of refugees fraught with tension and instability. In this respect, it appears that there is a need to develop interaction between, on one hand, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, which undertakes important and indispensable activities in this field, and, on the other hand, the CSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, which is located in Warsaw.

The delegation of Ukraine joins those States which, from this rostrum, have urged that draft resolution A/48/L.18 be adopted by consensus.

Mr. BATU (Turkey): As a country located at the very epicentre of the area covered by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) - an area that stretches from Vancouver to Vladivostok - and as a founding Member of the United Nations, Turkey is particularly pleased that we are again considering an item entitled "Cooperation between the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe".

Since the adoption of the Helsinki Document 1992 and General Assembly resolution 47/10, important steps have been taken to establish effective cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE. In this context, Turkey welcomes the exchange on 26 May 1993, between the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE, of letters concerning a framework for cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and the CSCE. General Assembly resolution 48/5 of 13 October 1993, which invites the CSCE to participate, as an Observer, in the sessions and work of the Assembly, constitutes another encouraging development in the right direction.

Having taken note of the Secretary-General's valuable report, my delegation wishes to reaffirm its resolute support for his efforts to build on this process of institutionalizing cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE.

Since the end of the cold war it has been our policy to refer to the challenges of the new international order. Despite a sufficiency of creative thinking, however, it has not been possible to establish a clear strategy. We believe that the starting-point for such a strategy should be realization of the fact that action on the challenges we are facing today is beyond the means and resources of a single organization. Thus, we need a collective-security architecture of mutually reinforcing institutions, in which all elements have a role to play. The interaction between global security and regional security requires effective cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and regional organizations. In this connection, Turkey believes that the still-developing institutionalization of cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and the CSCE sets a precedent.

As the Secretary-General observes in his report, there has been valuable cooperation in some parts of the former Yugoslavia and the former Soviet Union. Turkey attaches great importance to effective coordination between the activities of the United Nations and those of the CSCE in the field of conflict resolution and prevention, particularly in the Balkans and the Caucasus. In this respect, we regard the refusal of Belgrade to extend the mandate of the long-term CSCE missions as a further reason for concern. We share the Secretary-General's view that, until their withdrawal, these missions contributed significantly to the maintenance of stability in Kosovo, Sandjak and Vojvodina. Therefore, we strongly endorse the Security Council's call, in its resolution 855 (1993), for their return at the earliest possible date.

Following the end of the cold war, we embarked on the process of collective and cooperative security. We must admit, however, that quite a few opportunities have been lost along the way. Hence, we believe that the United Nations, under Chapter VIII of its Charter, should continue to develop adequate channels of communication,

coordination and interaction with the regional organizations. We must establish a more rational and cost-effective division of labour between the United Nations and regional organizations, and this must be based on transparency and complementarity.

The enhancement of security and stability in the vast geographical area between Vancouver and Vladivostok is a challenging task. It was in this context that my Minister, in his address to the General Assembly on 30 September this year, made the following call:

> "Turkey lies at the very epicenter of several regions making up the most turbulent part of the Northern hemisphere. We are actively engaged in the post-cold-war search for new approaches to build peace through multilateral action. Our objective is to reinforce the international security system. Only the United Nations can provide legitimacy to regional arrangements and institutions should the latter decide to act in the fields of ... preventive diplomacy, peace-keeping and peace enforcement.
>
> "All three of those categories of action are in demand on Turkey's periphery. My Government deploys all of its available assets to help defuse and resolve these crises. We strive to create and consolidate interlinked areas of solidarity and processes of cooperation." *(Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings, 11th meeting, p. 127)*

We pledge our commitment to and our support for the continued efforts to rise above the challenges of our times in the field of global and regional security.

Mr. PASHOVSKI (Bulgaria): I should like, first, to express my satisfaction at the presence of Mr. Wilhelm Höynck, Secretary-General of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). Mr. Höynck has made a remarkable contribution to the development of the CSCE process, and I have outstanding memories of the work that we have done together.

Over the past year and a half we have witnessed genuine and commendable progress in the cooperation between the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The dynamic processes on the European continent and the emergence of real and potential conflicts and points of tension in the CSCE area demonstrate the pressing need for a meaningful response to the challenges in the field of European and global security. The direct link between, on one hand, peace, stability and security in the region and, on the other hand, peace, stability and security in the world at large has prompted the beginning of a process of institutionalizing relations between the United Nations and European organizations - in particular, the CSCE.

Barely a year and a half ago, at the CSCE's Helsinki Summit in 1992, the Heads of State and Government of the participating States declared their understanding that the Conference is a regional arrangement in the sense of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter, and it is little more than a year since the question of cooperation between the two bodies was formally included in the agenda of the United Nations General Assembly. Over this relatively short period there has been significant positive development of the two bodies' common effort in a number of areas - from conflict prevention and crisis management to human rights issues and economic and environmental problems.

A sound basis for the promotion of the institutional modalities of this process has been laid. Bulgaria welcomes in this regard the conclusion on 26 May 1993 of an agreement between the United Nations Secretary-General and the Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE Council on the Framework for cooperation and coordination between the two organizations. By resolution 48/5, of 13 October 1993, the Conference was granted Observer status at the sessions and in the work of the General Assembly. Regular contact and exchange of information and documents have been established and maintained.

This has already yielded noticeable practical results in the field. The United Nations and the CSCE have been coordinating their actions in peacemaking, achieving valuable interaction in such areas of conflict or tension in the CSCE area as Nagorny Karabakh, South Ossetia, Moldova, Tajikistan and Abkhazia, and elsewhere. In the former Yugoslavia a positive framework of coordination has started to evolve, joining the efforts of the United Nations, the European Community and the CSCE, with the indispensable contribution of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Western European Union.

Cooperation has also been enhanced through the introduction of new, more productive forms of coordination in other equally important areas, such as preventive diplomacy and peace-building. We welcome the strengthening of relations between the United Nations and the CSCE in the spheres of human rights and humanitarian issues, including the questions of minorities, economic cooperation and environmental protection.

The positive momentum of this process, achieved over the past period, should be maintained and further developed. The emerging principles of cooperation, taking account of the need for coordination, complementarity,

practical division of labour and pragmatic approaches, should be further strengthened and consistently applied.

The United Nations has formidable experience and resources in a number of spheres pertaining to crisis management, such as peace-keeping, problems related to refugees and humanitarian assistance. The CSCE, for its part, has a valuable record and capabilities in early warning and democratic institution building. Both organizations have established their presence in conflict regions across the CSCE area.

The potential for stepping up practical, mutually reinforcing cooperation of the planning and carrying out of various missions, ranging from fact-finding to peacemaking and to assistance in strengthening democratic institutions, should be built upon in an effort to provide for even greater complementarity and synergy.

A greater integration of representatives from each organization into missions launched by the other is imperative for increased effectiveness. This could prompt a further strengthening of the organizational modalities for such coordination envisaged by the Framework of 26 May 1993. As a first step, a more efficient joint use of logistics and personnel, including joint use at the expert and higher levels, could be outlined and implemented.

The requirements of crisis management in the post-cold-war period, given the complex nature of today's conflicts in the CSCE area, lead us to contemplate opportunities for more global approaches to conflict resolution, involving the United Nations and the CSCE. In this regard, pilot case projects could be launched. They could comprise action programmes for cessation of hostilities, followed by post-conflict peacemaking and peace-building measures, involving disengagement of forces, deployment of military and civilian observers, provision of humanitarian assistance and strengthening of democratic institutions.

New ground for cooperation has been explored in such relatively new spheres for both organizations as assistance in the implementation of preventive and enforcement measures, including the imposition of economic sanctions by the Security Council. Practical cooperation and joint action has been launched in this area through the establishment of the European Community - CSCE Sanctions Assistance Missions in countries neighbouring the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), and close coordination with the Security Council sanctions Committee has been established. This effort should be pursued further, aiming to expand its scope by devising forms of cooperation and mutual support in addressing special economic problems arising from the implementation of these measures.

Great opportunities are being offered by the ongoing reform of the CSCE and its growing capabilities in early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management, security cooperation, peaceful settlement of disputes and planning for peace-keeping operations. It presents new possibilities for enhancing the institutional modalities of cooperation and coordination which should also be examined and utilized.

We welcome the report of the Secretary-General (A/48/549) outlining measures of cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE presented to the Assembly at its current session. In keeping with the need for regular examination and widening of the capabilities for enhanced coordination, we invite him to continue to focus his attention on this issue and to present his views, recommendations and proposals at the next sessions of the Assembly.

In an effort to contribute to enhancing the cooperation and coordination between the two organizations, a group of CSCE participating States, including Bulgaria, have elaborated and put forward a draft resolution for consideration in the current debate. We fully share the comments made by the representative of the CSCE Chairman-in-Office, who introduced the draft on behalf of the co-sponsors, and we hope that it will gain the support of the Assembly.

Mr. CASSAR (Malta): In November 1990 the Heads of State or Government of the States participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe assembled in Paris at a time of "profound change and historic expectations" (A/45/859, p. 4) to celebrate the end of an era of confrontation and division in Europe and to adopt the Charter of Paris for a New Europe.

The Charter required a steadfast commitment to democracy, based on human rights and fundamental freedoms, prosperity through economic liberty and social justice, and equal security for all CSCE States.

Europe was then liberating itself from the legacy of the past. The dawning of this time of promise, however, was soon to be clouded by instability and insecurity. When the CSCE Heads of State or Government met in July 1992 at the Helsinki Summit, they acknowledged that economic decline, social tension, aggressive nationalism, intolerance, xenophobia and ethnic conflicts were threatening stability in the CSCE area.

The Helsinki Summit registered yet another reality which had developed since the adoption of the Charter of Paris. In its Summit Declaration it stated:

> "For the first time in decades we are facing warfare in the CSCE region. New armed conflicts and massive use of force to achieve hegemony and territorial expansion continue to occur. The loss of life, human misery, involving huge numbers of refugees have been the worst since the Second World War. Damage to our cultural heritage and the destruction of property have been appalling." *(A/47/361, annex, para. 13)*

The challenge of change has brought with it a need to examine and assess our international efforts to build a new world order. In acknowledging and respecting the distinct contribution of the various international forums and organizations towards building peace in our time, we cannot but continue to explore and consolidate those avenues which foster closer cooperation in preventing and settling conflicts. It is within this context that the cooperation between the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe must be viewed.

Malta is particularly honoured to have actively contributed to formalizing such cooperation. The idea of having the CSCE declare itself a regional arrangement in terms of Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations was explored within this building while the Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Malta, Mr. Guido de Marco, was presiding over the forty-fifth session of the General Assembly, and was later proposed for the consideration of the meeting of the CSCE Council of Ministers in Prague early last year. During the Helsinki Follow-Up Meeting, Malta was foremost among those who proposed and promoted this declaration and submitted the proposal for its adoption.

During this past year, thanks to the commitment of the Foreign Minister of Sweden, who, as Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE, devoted great energy to giving this declaration concrete form, we have witnessed agreement on the "Framework for cooperation and coordination between the United Nations Secretariat and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe", signed on 26 May 1993. This cooperation is still in its initial phases, but even at such an early stage it has been put to the test in those zones of conflict which threaten stability in the CSCE region.

The understanding that the CSCE is a regional arrangement in the sense of Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations provides an important link between European and global security.

Experience throughout the past year has shown that results do not necessarily match efforts in conflict prevention and peace-building. That is why a greater effort is required to consolidate cooperation not only in areas which are immediately connected with security, but even in others which may be the root causes of future tensions, including areas of cooperation in the human dimension and economic cooperation.

That is why my delegation continues to regard the discussion of this item as extremely important, and it is in this spirit that my delegation supports the draft resolution on this subject which has been submitted by the representative of Sweden and which, together with other members of the CSCE, we are most happy to co-sponsor.

The President returned to the Chair.

Mr. MALONE (Canada): The draft resolution we are considering today addresses the enhancement of cooperation between the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), a regional arrangement in the sense of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter.

On 26 May of this year, the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE exchanged letters signalling their acceptance of a framework for United Nations-CSCE cooperation. This framework provides an excellent basis on which to build mutual cooperation in a variety of areas, particularly in maintaining international peace and security and promoting respect for human rights in the CSCE area.

Indeed, such cooperation is already occurring where it counts most: on the ground. In former Yugoslavia, Georgia, Nagorny Karabakh, Tajikistan and Moldova, the United Nations and the CSCE are cooperating and coordinating in effective ways to build peace and security. In Canada's view, such cooperation and complementarity of activity is absolutely essential to conflict-management efforts.

Within the CSCE, Canada has concentrated on developing the means for effective conflict management by establishing a range of instruments from fact-finding and good offices to mediation and preventive diplomacy. Canada pioneered the idea of CSCE peace-keeping as a necessary element in the spectrum of CSCE conflict-management instruments. We have sought, with other CSCE partners, to strengthen commitments in areas such as minorities, tolerance and democratic development. We

believe our approach to conflict management within the CSCE complements the type of proposals outlined in the "Agenda for Peace".

The relationship the CSCE enjoys with the United Nations is among the most advanced of any regional organization and, I would add, could serve as a useful model for other organizations and regions. Both organizations will benefit from cooperation and coordination in tangible ways.

For the United Nations, strengthening the capacity of regional organizations to promote regional and global security is one of the key objectives outlined in the "Agenda for Peace". A more important role for regional organizations in peace and security will free up time and resources for the United Nations, allowing it to concentrate on those situations where only the United Nations with its global political legitimacy, well-developed infrastructure and resources - can make an impact.

(*spoke in French*)

For the CSCE, closer cooperation and coordination with the United Nations will strengthen the CSCE's own capabilities in areas as diverse as early warning, conflict prevention and crisis management, including fact-finding, preventive diplomacy and peace-keeping. It will also ensure that global political pressure - which only the United Nations can marshal - is brought to bear if and when it is needed in support of CSCE efforts.

Enhanced cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and the CSCE will also make it possible to reduce duplication of effort and to improve effectiveness. This is an era of reduced resources and increased demands on such resources. There must therefore be an effective division of labour between the United Nations and the CSCE when they are active in the same field.

To improve communications, there must be more contacts. The CSCE has invited a representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to attend meetings of the CSCE Committee of Senior Officials and of the CSCE Council. Some organs of the United Nations regularly participate in CSCE meetings that deal with their areas of competence. In this respect, we are pleased that the United Nations, in resolution 48/5, has granted the CSCE observer status in the General Assembly.

In order to further the mutual goals of the United Nations and the CSCE in maintaining international peace and security, we fully endorse the draft resolution that we have co-sponsored and that has been presented to the General Assembly by Sweden, in its capacity as Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE, on behalf of all the States participating in the CSCE.

Mr. ERDÖS (Hungary) *(interpretation from French)*: Hungary welcomes the consideration of this item on cooperation between the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), as events show that this cooperation is becoming increasingly important. The activities and achievements of the CSCE, which will soon be marking the twentieth anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act - the first basic document of this process - are too well known to Members of the United Nations for me to dwell on them now. However, we wish to highlight two elements to which we attach particular importance.

First, during the cold war, the CSCE was virtually the only general forum for dialogue between East and West and it played a decisive role in the dismantling of the closed societies of Eastern Europe and in launching the process of reconciliation with the ideals of political and economic freedoms. Second, it is fitting to recall that, even at a time when Europe was politically and physically divided and a prey to an unprecedented ideological and military confrontation, the CSCE was able to provide a forum for comprehensive negotiation and cooperation which even today, because of its effectiveness and its infrastructure, can serve as a model to other regions in the world. Although the situation today is fundamentally different, it is important for us to recognize, in retrospect, the historic merits of the Helsinki process.

The CSCE is still a unique organization, including as it does all the countries of North America and Europe and all the former Republics of the former USSR, and thus bringing together, on the basis of its declared principles of the rule of law and democracy, a vast region extending from Vancouver to Vladivostok. The scope of CSCE activities is just as broad as its geographical dimension. They include all the factors involving security in all its dimensions. They range from military security to humanitarian and cultural cooperation. It also involves political principles governing relations between the participating countries, as well as matters concerning economic relations and protection of the environment.

According to the 1992 Helsinki Summit declaration, the CSCE is a regional arrangement under Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter. As such, it provides an important link between European security and global security and opens up new horizons for cooperation between the two organizations. The granting of Observer status to the CSCE by the General Assembly in October is certainly a significant step in this direction.

Today, the CSCE faces new challenges. It must seek its new identity by adapting to the changes that have occurred. Hungary highly values the CSCE activities aimed at averting and dealing with conflicts in the region and in promoting and consolidating human rights and the principles of the democratic system. Today's challenges include, in particular, flagrant violations of principles governing inter-State relations between CSCE countries, ethnic conflict, mass violations of human rights, including the rights of minorities, problems relating to nationalisms of all kinds, intolerance and xenophobia. The CSCE continues to deal with these issues and seeks to find the most appropriate ways of coping with these disturbing phenomena. Here we attach particular importance to the establishment 18 months ago of a CSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities. That decision clearly reflects the relationship between the rights of minorities and the maintenance of regional security. It is undeniable that the way these rights are dealt with has a decisive influence not only on stability in the CSCE region but also on international peace and security. Unfortunately, the litany of ethnic tension and conflicts in our region and their impact on the world situation only strengthens the validity of this statement.

Recently, cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE has become a tangible reality in many conflict situations. In the former Yugoslavia, one can mention the long-term missions in Kosovo, Sandjak and Vojvodina - missions which, until the recent refusal to extend their mandate, were a concrete manifestation of the CSCE's preventive diplomacy. Given the continuing crisis in the former Yugoslavia, we think it extremely important that these CSCE missions resume their activities as soon as possible.

We also welcome the assistance given by the countries of the European Union, through the CSCE, to the neighbouring States of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) in implementation of the sanctions imposed on that country by the Security Council. Missions to provide assistance in the implementation of the sanctions represent a significant contribution to enhancing the effectiveness of the sanctions regime.

The situations in Nagorny Karabakh, the Republic of Moldova, Georgia and Tajikistan, provide other examples of cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE. Of course, we have to determine the nature of such cooperation depending on the characteristics of the various situations. In so doing, some difficulties in coordination are sometimes inevitable, but they can be easily overcome if there is political will on all sides and if there is a willingness to act together in pursuing the same goals.

We advocate broader cooperation between the two organizations and the enhancement of its cooperation in all areas of common interest. In the practical division of tasks between the United Nations and the CSCE, it is important to avoid duplication and to emphasize the complementarity of their activities. We believe that the problems of cooperation and coordination must be dealt with in a flexible and pragmatic manner - not by using strict and rigid criteria - and on the basis of a specific analysis of a given situation.

Accordingly, we fully support the strengthening of cooperation between these two organizations, and this is reflected in our sponsorship of the draft resolution contained in document A/48/L.18. We are confident that it will be adopted by the General Assembly.

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with General Assembly resolution 48/5 of 13 October 1993, I now call on Mr. Wilhelm Höynck, Secretary-General of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Mr. HÖYNCK (Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE)): It is a great pleasure and indeed an honour for the Secretary-General of the CSCE to address the General Assembly on the issue of cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE. I greatly appreciate the friendly reception I have been accorded in this august body by the preceding speakers.

The Assembly's discussion today, the granting of Observer status to the CSCE, the formal establishment of a framework for cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE - all this serves one purpose: to firmly establish and to improve mutually reinforcing cooperation.

As a regional arrangement under Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations, the CSCE wants to make a contribution to the implementation of United Nations policy concepts. They have been outlined in "An Agenda for Peace", prepared by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali. His report stresses that

> "regional arrangements or agencies in many cases possess a potential that should be utilized in serving the functions [of] preventive diplomacy, peace-keeping, peacemaking and post-conflict peace-building." (*A/47/277, para. 64*)

One of the advantages of such regional action is that it can considerably lighten the heavy burden of the United Nations and in particular of the Security Council. This was the intention of the founding fathers and mothers of the United Nations. They laid down in Article 52 of the

Charter that the Members of the United Nations participating in such regional arrangements

> "shall make every effort to achieve pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements ... before referring them to the Security Council."

The CSCE was launched more than 20 years ago with the Helsinki Final Act of 1975 as its founding political constitution. But the fundamental changes in the geopolitical environment within the CSCE area at the turn of the last decade also led to a dramatic transformation of the CSCE mission and profile. It became a vehicle for managing this historical change, with new tasks and new activities in the wide CSCE area from Vancouver to Vladivostok.

The new CSCE is based on a comprehensive concept of security. It closely relates the maintenance of peace with respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It links economic and environmental solidarity and cooperation with peaceful inter-State relations. This is the time for exploring all opportunities for new cooperative approaches to strengthening security. Now we must revitalize and consolidate the principle of indivisible security in the CSCE area.

The human dimension - that is, human rights, democracy and the rule of law - is the centre of the CSCE. Norms and commitments in this field have been elevated to unparalleled high levels. They are politically binding, and adherence is monitored in a cooperative system. When human-dimension implementation gives rise to concern, a variety of CSCE mechanisms is available, including fact-finding and rapporteur missions.

At the Moscow Human Dimension Meeting of the CSCE in September 1991 the participating States declared categorically and irrevocably that the commitments undertaken in the field of the human dimension

> "are matters of direct and legitimate concern to all participating States and do not belong exclusively to the internal affairs of the State concerned".

This breakthrough levelled the traditionally almost insurmountable walls of national sovereignty. In the interests of peace and stability, it opened the way for CSCE involvement at an early stage not only in external conflicts, but also in internal conflicts related to human-dimension issues.

Full integration of the human dimension into the broader range of conflict-prevention instruments is one of the priority tasks of the new CSCE. On this basis, the CSCE tries to face the formidable challenges of ongoing wars, ethnic tensions and overall lack of progress towards new stability in the CSCE area. Under the dynamic guidance of the Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE, the Swedish Foreign Minister, Baroness Margarethe af Ugglas, new impulse has been given to CSCE operations, consultations and negotiations.

CSCE operations have extended considerably. Concrete and practical contributions to conflict prevention and, in some cases, crisis management have been made by the growing number of CSCE missions in the field, by the expanding activities of the CSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights and by the CSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities. The overall number of CSCE missions operative this year has been eight. Some were mainly conflict prevention; others in the first place crisis management missions. These small-scale missions are deployed in the Balkans, the Baltic and the Caucasus area. All the missions contributed in varying degrees to stabilizing the respective situations.

It is deeply regrettable - as preceding speakers have already said - that the CSCE missions to Kosovo, Sandjak and Vojvodina in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) could not continue their very useful presence and work in the area because the authorities in Belgrade did not extend the Memorandum of Understanding constituting the working basis of these missions. With the solid backing of the international community it should be possible to achieve a review of this uncooperative decision.

The CSCE is, like the United Nations, faced with the problem that the mandates of its missions continue to have to be extended because further time is needed to achieve satisfactory results. While we realize that, for conflict prevention and crisis management by peaceful means, patience is of the essence, regular and careful review of the situation is undertaken in order to insure that all parties to the conflict continue to be cooperative. It has to be underlined again and again that the conflicting parties cannot expect the missions to solve their problems, but that they themselves have to engage in a quest for settlement.

Since the beginning of 1992 the CSCE has been increasingly involved in the conflict in and around Nagorny Karabakh. With the repeated explicit support of the United Nations Security Council, the so-called Minsk Group countries of the CSCE have tried to move with the conflicting parties towards a solid framework for negotiating a solution. This framework must include a holding cease-fire that might be observed by about 500 CSCE monitors.

It is the common understanding of all CSCE participating States, laid down in the decisions of the Helsinki Summit 1992, that CSCE peace-keeping operations will not entail enforcement action. This is one of the compelling reasons for close cooperation and coordination between the CSCE and the United Nations, because the continuity of crisis management must be ensured if the application of peaceful means proves to be ineffective.

As all crisis settlement efforts are becoming increasingly difficult while the civilian population is exposed to unbearable suffering, the CSCE tries to improve its potential for conflict prevention. The first CSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, Mr. Max van der Stoel of the Netherlands, took office in January 1993. He has the task of providing early warning and, as appropriate, early action at the earliest possible stage in regard to tensions involving national minority issues. In this framework, the High Commissioner has become active in a great number of States, particularly in the Baltic and in the Balkans. The very positive response to his intensive activity in his first year of office showed that flexible, discreet and authoritative advice based on broad international support is one of the promising answers to our new challenges.

During the past year CSCE consultations have also achieved a new dimension. These consultations on all issues pertinent to the CSCE have centred around the conflicts with which the CSCE is seized. In addition, and as an important element of the development of a cooperative security structure, participating States can raise and are raising particular political and security concerns.

CSCE negotiations focused on measures of disarmament and confidence- and security-building. In the CSCE area the old threats of all-out military confrontation are gone. But large military potentials remain, while the area is facing new challenges. Furthermore, there is a risk of fragmentation of European security. The immediate concern is localized, typically small-scale resort to force. The CSCE is developing new arrangements the better to respond to these challenges and to counter the abuse of force externally and internally. Decisions on transparency of defence planning, stabilizing measures for localized crisis situations and principles of arms transfers and military contacts are now under preparation. The new code of conduct governing relations between States with regard to security-related matters is being negotiated. That would be a landmark contribution to cooperative security approaches.

This selection of CSCE activities underlines the complementarity of CSCE and United Nations action. The CSCE has a deep and sincere interest in mutually reinforcing cooperation with the United Nations as well as with other regional organizations. Each should preserve its own area of action and responsibility. We have to look for a constructive division of labour on the basis of comparative advantages. Since our means will hardly suffice to meet all challenges, we cannot permit duplication of efforts.

The many positive comments and the substantial proposals made here today are really encouraging. I appreciate the prospect of the adoption of draft resolution A/48/L.18, with its impressive list of sponsors. We all know that there is still room for deepening coordination and cooperation between the CSCE and the United Nations. I am fully confident that we will make progress. This will increase the potential available for solving the challenges that we are facing. There is no other choice. Only a multi-institutional structure can maintain the will and provide the means necessary to reach our common aim - a lasting and peaceful order in the CSCE area.

The PRESIDENT: Before taking action on the draft resolution, I should like to announce that the following countries have become sponsors of draft resolution A/48/L.18: Belarus, the Czech Republic, Georgia, Iceland, Luxembourg, Poland and The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/48/L.18.

May I take it that the Assembly decides to adopt the draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/48/L.18 was adopted (resolution 48/19).

The PRESIDENT: May I also take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 26?

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 151 (continued)

UNITED NATIONS INITIATIVE ON OPPORTUNITY AND PARTICIPATION: DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/48/L.19)

Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone): The Sierra Leone delegation attaches importance to the timely initiative on opportunity and participation formulated and proposed by the Government of the Independent State of Papua New Guinea.

These concepts of opportunity and participation are not only eternal verities but remain essential prerequisites for the socio-economic development of the developing countries. The importance of the proposal further lies in the fact that both concepts are for the first time being addressed together in this forum to highlight the imbalances that characterize particularly the economic activities in many of our developing countries, where the vast majority are given or offered a dismal fraction of the requisite opportunities to enable them to participate effectively in the socio-economic development of their respective countries.

Indeed, mineral as well as other natural resources in our countries have to be mined or exploited to provide much-needed revenue and foreign exchange for the use of Governments, but a cause for regret is the continuing dearth of adequate educational and other meaningful opportunities and facilities to enable the indigenous people to acquire not only the opportunity but also the experience needed to hold meaningful positions that will enable them to participate effectively in the overall economic development of their respective countries. In short, there is an urgent need for an increase in the opportunities that are open to nationals of our countries to serve as floodgates for meaningful participation in the ongoing and future economic-development projects and ventures in many of our countries.

The Sierra Leone delegation also welcomes the decision of the Government of Papua New Guinea to submit what we consider to be a well-thought-out proposal to have an ad hoc panel of distinguished experts and experienced persons broadly representative of the international community appointed as the "United Nations Panel on Opportunity and Participation" to conduct a comprehensive, systematic and thorough study of opportunity and participation, with particular reference to the economies of the developing countries, with the objective of finding practical options for increasing and maximizing opportunity and participation in the economies of developing countries. It is expected that that panel will review relevant areas of public policy, the legal system, administration, economics, finance and banking, and will assess the contributions which Governments, the private sectors and non-governmental organizations can make in linking opportunity to participation.

The appropriate nature and timeliness of the Papua New Guinea initiative for most developing countries cannot be overemphasized. The unhealthy nature of the economies of many developing countries, the reduction of flows of official development assistance and the increasing competition for foreign aid, investments and loans are additional reasons to undertake a study that will focus attention on and identify the underlying causes of the poor performance of the economies and other development aspects of many developing countries and to emerge with recommendations - including hard work, of course - as to how to overcome our poor economic performance and underdevelopment.

Secondly, there is the time-frame within which the panel should commence and complete its work and its mandate. Unlike other proposals before the United Nations that do not have any stated dates for the beginning and completion of their implementation, the proposal under consideration specifies January 1994 as the date on which the panel should commence its work, and the report should be submitted for consideration by the time of the fiftieth session of the General Assembly, in 1995. In addition, in the draft resolution the Secretary-General is requested to submit a progress report on the work of the panel to the General Assembly at its forty-ninth session next year. This, we believe, underlines the urgency of the situation and what is expected of the panel that will be so constituted.

The Sierra Leone delegation is persuaded that this initiative will not further burden the resources of the Organization in as much as resources for its implementation will be sought from voluntary contributions from Member States and other international organizations. This initiative should not only complement the proposed new agenda for development which is under preparation by the Secretary-General but should catalyses the implementation of the United Nations New Agenda for the Development of Africa in the 1990s and the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the 1990s and should act as a further commitment to the full implementation of Agenda 21. The recommendations presented by the panel, which it is proposed to establish, should also include a definition and elaboration of what opportunities for participation should entail in the context of the forthcoming United Nations World Summit for Social Development and the Global Conference on the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States.

Finally, the proposal deserves the support of every delegation at the United Nations because it is, above all, people-oriented. It underscores the mobilization of people and resources, on the basis of an awareness of the actual circumstances in which people, particularly rural villagers, women and other disadvantaged groups, spend their lives. My delegation therefore fully supports the proposal and commends the draft resolution for adoption.

Mrs. JAGAN (Guyana): In this post-cold-war era the United Nations is both challenged and stimulated by the opportunities afforded it to transform the adverse conditions under which so many of the world's inhabitants labour.

The challenges range from the more recent preoccupation with peace-keeping, peacemaking and preventive diplomacy, to the traditional tasks of facilitating and promoting social and economic development and the safeguarding of both sovereign and individual rights, including the right to development and the equitable participation of all in the benefits of that process.

The opportunities are similarly multifaceted. The prevailing environment in which the world is no longer constrained by the forces of ideological polarity presents us with an unprecedented opportunity to effect ready solutions to the very challenges which confront us as a world community. It is a chance to extend ourselves, to allow for a greater involvement by all nations in a concerted attempt to remedy the problems of the world.

The item on which the Assembly is now focused speaks of a United Nations initiative on opportunity and participation. The main theme of this subject is the issue of development. This item brings a new perspective to the development debate at a time when a fresh viewpoint is badly needed. After all these years, is it not time to focus on practical ways of enhancing international cooperation so that attention can truly focus on the means of implementation? Developing countries are not helped by declarations which restate old platitudes without a concurrent commitment of political will and resources. It is a sad, but I fear accurate, statement that our countries are further away from the goal of attaining a better life for their peoples than they were when we first began this dialogue in the international arena some 30 years ago.

It is indicative of the measure of importance that the membership of the Organization attaches to the issue of development, and to the role of the United Nations in achieving it, that we at this particular juncture are dealing with so many aspects pertinent to its global attainment. Many representatives speaking at the current session, as well as at the last session, have called for the launching of an agenda for development, on which we eagerly await the report of the Secretary-General.

It is not by coincidence that both the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Group of 77 have endorsed an initiative for the reactivation of the North-South dialogue. Meanwhile we continue to deliberate on the implementation of Agenda 21 and the sustainable development of small island and low-lying coastal States; on the situation concerning least developed and land-locked countries; and on the New Agenda for the Development of Africa in the 1990s, to cite but a few of our developmental preoccupations in this body.

Whether one speaks of opportunity and participation in the economic and social process at the national level, in the context of activities of the United Nations, or in relation to the role and activities of the private sector, a common thread is the development goal that is the object of consideration.

The attainment of the goal of economic and social development is of paramount importance for our countries. Such development must be balanced and sustainable. It must take account of our physical and cultural heritage and diversity. It must also take account of the requirement for bequeathing this heritage to future generations. It must ensure the rational development of all our resources, both human and material.

The developmental process in which we are engaged must be equitable. It must meet the needs and requirements of every group in our society at the national level, and of countries large and small at the global level. The equitable distribution of resources and the opportunity for all to share in their benefits are critical elements in the development challenge with which we are faced.

The Guyana delegation is of the view that we must therefore respond to this challenge in a rational way. The time has come for us to bring together the various approaches to a possible solution in a single, common agenda. The opportunity for concerted action to address the development imperative rests with this session of the General Assembly. We wish to commend the Government of Papua New Guinea for this laudable initiative and we invite the Assembly to collaborate in charting the way forward.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
FORTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records

57th PLENARY MEETING
Wednesday, 17 November 1993 at 10 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. INSANALLY (Guyana)

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 151 *(continued)*

UNITED NATIONS INITIATIVE ON OPPORTUNITY AND PARTICIPATION: DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/48/L.19)

Mrs. SELMANE (Algeria) *(interpretation from French)*: We listened carefully to the statement made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Papua New Guinea. His presentation gives a picture of all the efforts already undertaken to prepare and develop the initiative with a view to the establishment of a "United Nations Panel on Opportunity and Participation".

At a time when our Organization is tackling the preparation of an agenda for development and working to make its fiftieth anniversary the target date for concluding a process of renewal and of adaptation to the new challenges facing mankind, this initiative is certainly timely and important.

The especially difficult economic situation of the developing countries, exacerbated by an unfavourable international environment, underscores the importance of the link between peace and development in today's world. The concept of development has itself become especially complex, and there is an ever-growing awareness of the need to integrate fully the elements of sustainability and human security; hence, the timeliness and the high stakes attached to the field of investigation proposed for the United Nations Panel on Opportunity and Participation. The Panel's independence and the competence of its members are such as to imbue its analyses and recommendations with the relevance, originality and boldness needed for it to have a salutary impact as we approach the fiftieth anniversary.

The Algerian delegation therefore wishes to reaffirm its support for this initiative, and it fully supports the draft resolution (A/48/L.19) that defines its objectives and modalities.

Mr. McKINNON (New Zealand): On behalf of my delegation, I would like to extend our thanks and appreciation to the Honourable John Kaputin, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Papua New Guinea, for his opening of the debate on this item and for his introduction of the draft resolution contained in document A/48/L.19.

The United Nations Initiative on Opportunity and Participation was considered at the South Pacific Forum meeting in Nauru in August this year. The Heads of Government of Pacific States gave their support to the proposal at that meeting, and Forum members were encouraged to support it at this session of the General Assembly.

We believe that the further examination of this issue may help our understanding as we move to shape a new agenda for development in the 1990s.

Sustainable human development is now identified as the crucial target for our age. A key ingredient in that concept is the ability of people, as individuals or as groups, to participate fully and effectively in the economic, social, cultural and political processes that affect their lives. We

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, Room C-178, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

93-87207 (E)

Distr. GENERAL

A/48/PV.57
29 November 1993

ENGLISH

now recognize that development which does not deal with this dimension is seriously flawed. For development to be equitable and sustainable it must reach out and encompass all of society, not just those individuals and groups who happen to be historically well positioned to benefit from development. The link between economic and social development and peace and stability is now well established.

The Government of Papua New Guinea and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Papua New Guinea, the Honourable John Kaputin, are performing a very valuable service in bringing to our attention the fact that rapid economic growth can misfire if we do not provide opportunities for participation by and benefit to individuals throughout society. The draft resolution before us represents an endeavour to advance the process of identifying and remedying the barriers to opportunity and to participation that clearly do exist in many countries.

There is much fruitful work that can be drawn on by the panel proposed in the draft resolution. In particular, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has focused attention on this very issue in the 1993 *Human Development Report* and again last week in a very thought-provoking statement made by the new Administrator of UNDP, Gus Speth, to the Second Committee. We would encourage the panel to work closely with UNDP in the execution of its mandate, amongst the other avenues it will explore.

Given the potential range of issues relevant to opportunity and participation, my delegation believes it is important that the panel's work be carefully delimited and well focused. The panel will need to determine specific directions in which it wishes its work to proceed.

The theme of people's participation is receiving attention in a number of United Nations forums, for example in the elaboration of an agenda for development, which will complement the "Agenda for Peace", and also in preparations for the International Conference on Population and Development, the Fourth World Conference on Women and the World Summit for Social Development. The initiative of examination, by the panel, of the issues of opportunity and participation is therefore timely across a broad spectrum of United Nations activities. The panel's reports to the General Assembly should provide a valuable input to these broader discussions under way in the United Nations.

I think we all agree that impulses for participation should be better understood and nurtured. We therefore look to the proposed panel to advance this process.

Mr. NYAKYI (United Republic of Tanzania): My delegation joins previous speakers in congratulating the Government of Papua New Guinea for the proposal on the United Nations initiative on opportunity and participation and warmly welcomes the stimulating statement with which the Honourable John Kaputin, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Papua New Guinea, opened the debate on this initiative.

As prerequisites for human development, opportunity and participation are so self-evident that we tend to take them for granted. In any social system people have to pursue their aspirations for development, and opportunity and participation are necessary for their advancement. Necessary as it is for human development, the spirit of initiative and enterprise is inadequate if unaccompanied by opportunity and participation. My delegation believes that this has been the experience of many countries, particularly developing countries, in the last several years. An important objective of the reforms undertaken by many countries around the world, especially developing countries, has been to provide opportunity and participation for their citizens.

In the case of my own country, Tanzania, we learned very early on that while nothing can replace one's own efforts for economic and social advancement, supportive intervention from the outside has a critical role to play in the process of development. That role essentially involves making available to citizens the opportunity to develop themselves and to participate in making the decisions that affect their lives.

Each of our countries has had its own experience. The Papua New Guinea initiative provides us with a very welcome opportunity to share these experiences and to reach a common understanding on ways and means of enlarging the opportunity and participation of our citizens in their own advancement and in that of their countries.

Since the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly, when the idea was first presented, we have had a number of opportunities to discuss the proposal and to assess its contribution to the evident and urgent need to increase the opportunity and participation, not only of citizens in the local economy as stated earlier, but also of developing countries in the global economy. At both the national and the international level, opportunity and participation are required for development. Unfortunately, at the international level the concept of opportunity and participation has not been fully accepted. That is why the call for an agenda for development is very timely. As we await the Secretary-General's report on this subject, the proposal by the Government of Papua New Guinea gives

us a welcome opportunity to initiate a discussion which can only enrich the debate on this important item.

The fact that reform efforts in the developing countries to foster growth and development continue to be frustrated by the persistent inequalities in international economic relations constitutes a serious obstacle to the establishment of global partnership and to the realities of interdependence in the world today. The proposal on opportunity and participation is both timely and urgent, as it allows us to examine past failures in our attempts to build a just and equitable international system and to chart new and innovative strategies for sustainable development. We have attended several international conferences focused on different aspects and dimensions of human cooperation and development in an attempt to seek solutions to growing inequalities in the global economy.

The proposal by Papua New Guinea rightly points out that even after several decades of United Nations resolutions, expert studies, special international conferences, including the North-South dialogue and plans of action, many developing countries are experiencing static or declining rates of economic growth, while many of the most serious and widespread difficulties experienced in securing opportunities for economic participation by individuals, groups and firms in developing countries remain largely unaddressed.

The United Nations International Development Strategy for the Fourth United Nations Development Decade lists six goals for the achievement of its aims:

> "(a) A surge in the pace of economic growth in the developing countries;
>
> (b) A development process that is responsive to social needs, seeks a significant reduction in extreme poverty, promotes the development and utilization of human resources and skills and is environmentally sound and sustainable;
>
> (c) An improvement of the international systems of money, finance and trade so as to support the development process;
>
> (d) A setting of strength and stability in the world economy and sound macro-economic management, nationally and internationally;
>
> (e) A decisive strengthening of international development cooperation;
>
> (f) A special effort to deal with the problems of the least developed countries, the weakest among the developing countries." *(resolution 45/199, annex, chap. II, para. 14)*

The reality is that the international community is nowhere near realizing the above goals, as the circle of prosperity has not widened to include the majority of the developing countries that are not so fortunate as to receive favoured access to finance, markets and technology. In the Uruguay Round, the priorities and interests of developing countries have figured marginally even in areas such as markets for agricultural commodities, which constitute the mainstay of their economies. Commodity markets have continued to be depressed, and to be destabilized by changing demand and supply conditions. Prices of commodities have declined further, in some cases even in nominal terms. There is a danger that the establishment of regional trade blocs may exclude many developing countries from preferential access to the markets of the developed countries.

The least developed countries are almost exclusively dependent on official development assistance (ODA) for their external financing and, because of their limited access to international financing markets and foreign direct investment, they have been unable to benefit from an increased flow of external resources to developing countries that has taken place in the past few years.

With the dramatic and profound changes that have taken place in the world political and economic scene, the United Nations has an unprecedented opportunity to play its Charter role in the vital area of economic and social development through important international conferences, including the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, the forthcoming World Summit for Social Development and the International Conference on Population and Development, to mention but a few. The preparatory process for these conferences has already identified the problems encountered in contemporary international economic relations and in development, and this should facilitate the search for their solutions.

The proposed United Nations initiative on opportunity and participation will serve as a useful link for various resolutions adopted by the United Nations and especially by United Nations organized international conferences in seeking a methodology through which those goals and objectives may be realized. The Human Development Report for 1993 states:

> "People everywhere are certainly demanding much greater access to political, economic and social opportunities. They might not expect 'full participation' - but they do want a steady advancement towards it. Participation is, after all, a process, not an event ... it helps maximize the use of human capabilities and is thus a means of increasing levels of social and economic development." *(pp. 21 and 22)*

The same can be said about nations. Opportunity and participation will certainly bring about effective partnership and equitable coöperation in the sphere of international economic relations. Effective economic integration of developing countries in the world economy could be a major stimulus to global economic activities, provided it remains open and outward-looking and does not result in additional external barriers.

My delegation fully supports draft resolution A/48/L.19, which was introduced by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Papua New Guinea. It seeks the appointment of a United Nations Panel on Opportunity and Participation composed of a small number of distinguished experts and eminent persons, broadly representative of the international community, in order to prepare a comprehensive report to be considered during the General Assembly's fiftieth session.

I am also pleased to announce my delegation's sponsorship of the draft resolution, and I share the hope of many previous speakers that it will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. LAING (Belize): It may well be the case that undemocratic and illiberal regimes are becoming an increasingly rare species. As we approach the end of the millennium, some think that this trend can be seen everywhere. While we have not witnessed the wholesale emergence of stable liberal democracies, liberal democracy has become the universal political and economic aspiration, spanning different regions and cultures around the globe.

Liberal principles such as individual freedom, popular sovereignty, free markets and free trade have become the new watchwords and the means through which underdevelopment can allegedly be definitively conquered. The prescription to solve our social, political and economic problems has now become that we in the developing world must replace traditional forms of social organization with economically rational ones based on function and efficiency; we must open our markets to international trade and we must tighten our belts, both metaphorically and in reality. Structural adjustment, too, is the popular euphemism.

Over the past two decades many in the developing world have dutifully followed the regimen that has been laid out for us. All of us have embarked on a process of reforms and the creation of structures wherein we must take the same prescribed medicine for the ills that plague us - and, indeed, several of us who have swallowed the pill have experienced reasonably high levels of material prosperity and long periods of stability and positive economic growth.

However, that is only part of the picture. In many countries there have been no improvements. In fact, the socio-political and economic situation has deteriorated to the point where it threatens international stability. Problems abound in many of the countries that have accepted the prescription and swallowed the medicine. Indeed, it would be accurate to say that the social, political and economic gap between the developed and the developing worlds has widened, even as we in the developing world attempt to adopt the measures that are indispensable are told that we must wait for growth and development to take off.

Why is this so? We believe that part of the truth lies in the fact that over the past quarter of a century we have been experiencing top-down development. Solutions have been mandated from the top - and when we say "the top", we mean the international economic and financial institutions, development-oriented multilateral institutions and, indeed, those of us in leadership positions in our Governments. We have told our people that they must follow the uniform prescription to overcome the myriad problems.

We have made a fundamental mistake throughout this entire process. We have not always related the institutions, structures and remedies to the genuine needs of our people. And we have failed to give the people an adequate role in articulating and guiding their own political, economic and social destinies. We have compounded the problem by forgetting a basic truism, namely, that the primary purpose of development is to enlarge people's opportunities and choices.

We agree with the *Human Development Report 1993* that:

> "People today have an urge - an impatient urge - to participate in the events that shape their lives. And that impatience brings many dangers and opportunities. It can dissolve into anarchy, ethnic violence or social disintegration. But if properly nurtured in a responsive national and global framework, it can also become a source of tremendous vitality and innovation for the creation of new and

more just societies." *(UNDP Human Development Report 1993, p. 1)*

We see the Papua New Guinea initiative on opportunity and participation in this light. It provides an opportunity to begin the dialogue on the means and mechanisms through which we can involve our peoples in the process of development and further ensure that we create opportunities that will enable them and us to meet their genuine needs. After all, a primary purpose of development is to create and enlarge social, economic, developmental and political opportunities.

Let us, therefore, go beyond the formal symbolism of talking about grass roots. The people must fully and truly participate in the widest possible horizontal range - that is to say, villagers, trade unions, the aged, youth, native peoples and others usually overlooked in the top-down, verticalized process. In this light, this proposal is very timely. It is also opportune, because we are about to embark on a new dialogue about the issues of development with the presentation of the Secretary-General's agenda for development. We are therefore happy to act as a sponsor of the draft resolution embodying this worthy initiative.

If all that this initiative accomplishes is that the agenda for development and the Assembly fully accept and articulate the critical importance of popular participation, it will go down in history as a signal accomplishment.

Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vanuatu): Odd as it might seem, this is the first occasion on which our delegation has come to the podium to speak during the current session of the General Assembly. Thus, it gives us great pleasure to join in the congratulatory remarks previously addressed to you, Sir, on your unanimous election to preside over the General Assembly at its forty-eighth session.

Quite aside from our long and deep personal friendship, and that of our respective countries and delegations, you are well known for your professionalism, your diplomatic skills and your integrity. These are not easy qualities to come by. You, therefore, are one of the most highly respected of all of our colleagues in this House. The manner in which you have led our deliberations thus far has certainly justified our great faith in you.

We also take pleasure in thanking your predecessor and commending his efforts during the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly. We also join in the congratulations extended to the new States that have recently joined the United Nations, bringing us yet one step closer to our long-cherished goal of universality in the membership of the world body.

Vanuatu is a sponsor of draft resolution A/48/L.19 on the United Nations initiative on opportunity and participation. As such, we associate ourselves with the statement made two days ago by the Foreign Minister of Papua New Guinea in introducing that draft resolution. There is no doubt that the active involvement and full participation of everyone in a given society - men and women, young and old, the economically advantaged and the disadvantaged, the physically firm and the infirm - are essential elements in the process of economic and social development. Doors of opportunity that remain permanently closed to any segment of a society tend to diminish the ability of that society to realize its full potential. Similarly, on a global scale doors of opportunity that remain permanently closed seriously diminish the ability of mankind to realize its full potential.

The process that led the world to Rio de Janeiro last year for the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development taught us the value of a global partnership. However, for that lesson to have a lasting and meaningful impact the partnership will have to be further nurtured, strengthened and institutionalized at its very roots. All segments of society, beginning with the smallest, most distant and most diverse communities, have their own unique contributions to make. Those contributions should all be encouraged and valued for their unique worth.

That is one important aspect of the proposal on opportunity and participation. There is another, which we think should also be borne in mind.

As electoral democracy spreads throughout the world - to big nations and small, in every corner of the globe, and to every village, hamlet and outer island - few ideas could more appropriate or more timely than opportunity and participation. For, as electoral democracy spreads throughout the world, new questions are being raised in both the new democracies and the older democracies - questions about economic justice and what the future holds in store for those who have never had much margin for economic error. Fears are being articulated about social equality, and new concerns are being expressed about the future of international or multilateral democracy.

Every day, those who live and labour in developing countries - particularly the smallest, the poorest and the most ecologically fragile - find themselves facing less and less certain futures. Every day, the representatives of the people of such countries find themselves having to defend the right of those people to be heard, in all forums, on all issues, and having to defend, in international forums, the very democratic principles and practices that most people recognize as being essential in their own countries.

We cannot help asking: is it not a cruel hoax to tell our people that they can have a voice in choosing a Government and Government representatives but then to construct elaborate processes that have the effect of denying those Governments and those Government representatives the opportunity to have an effect on the decision-making process? Is it not reasonable to expect the normal fundamental rules of participation in the democratic processes within countries to be looked upon favourably with respect to participation in the decision-making processes in international forums?

Many ideas are brought to mind by the initiative of the Foreign Minister of Papua New Guinea. Like other delegations, we have limited ourselves to commenting on a minimum of those ideas. We view this proposal as another important step in the global enfranchisement of those who are not yet enfranchised to the fullest extent possible. The ideas that may be generated by this proposal, with their potential impact on peoples, communities and nations, are its most appealing aspect.

Like other sponsors of the draft resolution, we continue to be open-minded and receptive to the ideas of others. Therefore, consultations with a number of interested delegations have continued, and some very positive suggestions have been made and will be reflected in a revised text. It is to be hoped that the draft resolution will be adopted by consensus and that all of us will have an opportunity to participate in further refinement and development of this very timely and well-intentioned idea.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform delegations that, in order to give the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth Committee an opportunity to review the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/48/L.19, action on it is postponed to a date to be announced.

AGENDA ITEM 40

THE SITUATION IN CENTRAL AMERICA: PROCEDURES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A FIRM AND LASTING PEACE AND PROGRESS IN FASHIONING A REGION OF PEACE, FREEDOM, DEMOCRACY AND DEVELOPMENT:

(a) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/48/586)

(b) DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/48/L.21)

The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Mario Carias Zapata, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Honduras, to introduce draft resolution A/48/L.21.

Mr. CARIAS ZAPATA (Honduras) *(interpretation from Spanish):* I wish, on behalf of the countries of the Central American isthmus, to say again how pleased we are that you, Sir, are presiding at this General Assembly session, in which each of us has promised you support and cooperation as you discharge your delicate tasks.

At its forty-seventh session, the General Assembly praised the Central American effort to achieve peace through implementation of the "Procedures for the establishment of a firm and lasting peace in Central America" and of the agreements, adopted at summit meetings, that reaffirm the decision of the Central American Presidents to declare Central America a region of peace, freedom, democracy and development.

Today, Central America is at one of the most important stages in its recent history - that of the consolidation of democracy. Evidence of this is the conclusion of the international Treaty known as the Tegucigalpa Protocol of 13 December 1991, which created the Central American Integration System (SICA). That Protocol reflects the political and legal regeneration of the region as a cohesive exercise in integrated development to be undertaken through machinery of regional coordination - machinery that has been functioning since 1 February this year - with a view to reinvigorating economic, social, cultural and political programmes, as well as programmes concerning the Central American environment.

We therefore agree with the efforts of the United Nations Secretary-General, who, since 1992, has been striving to bring about coordination within the United Nations and who, in his most recent memorandum, talks of the need for an integrated approach to development, based on the indivisible elements of peace, democracy and development programmes.

Furthermore, we believe that the establishment of democratic regimes in our countries does not by itself guarantee solution of the major social, political and economic problems that we, as countries and as a region, confront. Democracy in Central America requires understanding and sustained support from the international community.

The Secretary-General, in his report to the General Assembly, says:

> "Social disparities remain a source of tensions. With regard to health care, housing, education and employment, the region's indicators continue to be a cause for concern. Across the region, extreme poverty has been on the increase in recent years. In addition,

new challenges have emerged, such as drug trafficking and environmental degradation." *(A/48/586, para. 7)*

To trace and undertake a new course of development in peace and democracy, our countries require, as a minimum, a framework of stability that is in accordance with the special features of each country. The common denominator is the achievement of national consensus in respect of peace and development. That is how the socio-economic problems will be solved and the sustained human development necessary to ensuring that resources reach the most needy sectors of the population will be made possible.

The Central American Governments, aware of their historic responsibility to ensure that their peoples may enjoy peace, security, justice and social development, have consistently striven, in all areas and at all levels, to achieve the goals that were set in 1987. That is why in this forum, we speak with a single voice, in a spirit of unity, and with a single hope - that better standards of living may be provided for our peoples.

The Central American Presidents met 14 times and signed agreements of the greatest importance for Central America. During those meetings they called for the support and assistance of the international community. Its response was not long in coming: the participation of the United Nations in the peace processes in El Salvador and Nicaragua, and now in Guatemala, and its participation in programmes of cooperation such as the Special Plan of Economic Cooperation for Central America (PEC), has mobilized important resources for the region as part of emergency programmes, and immediate-action and social-and-economic recovery programmes.

The Programme for Displaced Persons, Refugees and Returnees developed through the United Nations Development Programme has made an innovative contribution in Central America by establishing procedures which have mobilized various social sectors in the region to work together to find solutions to common problems.

Nevertheless, regardless of the efforts undertaken and the resources invested in Central America, there remain serious political, economic and social problems which could nullify the gains made to date. In the present debate in the Assembly, and throughout the general debate, representatives of our countries at the very highest level have expressed concern on the subject - and, because of its importance, I consider it appropriate to remind members of this.

Thus, the President of El Salvador, Mr. Alfredo Cristiani Burkard, stated:

"The rhythm of transformation occurs in a way that cannot be resisted. We see this in the changing international, political and economic relations of our time. An almost spontaneous restructuring has followed the removal of so many straitjackets. And this restructuring has brought to light what has always been most important: the real problems. As the East-West conflict has disappeared, almost no one speaks about the North-South conflict or alternative alignments, but the serious problems of inequality, critical poverty and dependence have not been resolved. They are still with us. And they are a challenge for this new order which we are trying to create on a more rational and reasonable foundation." *(Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings, 5th meeting, p. 3)*

Minister Bernd H. Niehaus Quesada of Costa Rica reminded us:

"Those who were interested in a Central America full of bloodshed and trenches do not want to deal with a Central America of the poor, the Central America that calls for cooperation for development, for understanding of its human and economic tragedies." *(Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings, 23rd meeting, p. 9)*

I should also like to remind members of the efforts of the Government of Nicaragua to promote economic recovery within the framework of and adjustment process that includes economic growth and development - a process that has been hampered by the violence that was a product of war, by the needs of thousands of displaced persons, refugees and unemployed who must be integrated into the country's economic activities and by the effects of natural disasters. The Government of Nicaragua has also made important progress in bringing about broad social consensus through national dialogue, the adoption of measures that will lay the bases for reconstruction, and economic and social development.

In fact the case of Nicaragua is special. It has had to go through a threefold transition. It is overcoming the aftermath of war; it is building democracy; and it is restoring dynamism and strength to the economy in a society that is still polarized. That makes it necessary to give Nicaragua special treatment which will allow for flexibility in the application of structural-adjustment measures, so that, without losing its sense of direction, it can obtain loans and investments - on preferential terms -

designed to provide incentives to social investment and local production, and enable it to adapt to the pace of fiscal adjustment, the reduction of import customs duties and the freeing up of the financial system.

As part of these efforts, the Central American Presidents met in Guatemala City from 27 to 29 October last in their fourteenth summit. Their political Declaration contained this statement:

> "The democracy we have been building with such great hope is beginning to reap the fruits of a peaceful Central America - a Central America invigorated by a new integrationist vision capable of changing the course of history."

The Presidents also declared:

> "... we have launched a bold and innovative integration process that has given us regional institutions and forums that include presidential summits, the Central American Parliament and the Central American Court of Justice, all of which are expressions of the legal and political framework established by the Tegucigalpa Protocol."

In the operative part of the Declaration the Presidents decided that they

> "... will promote the establishment of a Central American social investment fund under the auspices of the Central American Integration Bank to fight poverty, to promote social works, and to improve the people's standard of living by financing social development programmes."

They also called on the international community to support this initiative at the international conference for peace and development in Central America which they hope to convene in 1994.

The Presidents stated:

> "Central America offers all the necessary conditions for the independent implementation of a peace plan and an agenda for development. Our efforts, together with specific expressions of international solidarity, will allow us to make our region a model for resolving conflicts, consolidating peace, and enhancing democracy through comprehensive development."

Following these guidelines laid down at the Summit, yesterday the Central American countries, at the invitation of the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), attended a technical international meeting with the community of donor countries, specialized agencies of the United Nations system, and other regional organizations, with a view to relaunching and revitalizing programmes and reviewing what has been achieved so far, and seeking new initiatives in multilateral cooperation for the region.

Central America, like other regions, has to face and overcome serious difficulties that are curbing its development. We are therefore striving to achieve diversification of our production structures, in the quest for new markets for our products and in order to attract the necessary foreign-investment flows. As Mr. Arosemena, on behalf of the late Mr. Julio E. Linares, the Foreign Minister of Panama, reminded us in the Assembly:

> "The Central American countries are striving to build a peaceful, free, democratic and developing region. For that reason, the efforts to bolster peace that have been initiated require actions capable of solving our economic, social cultural and humanitarian problems in order to strengthen our peoples' faith in democracy." *(Official records of the General Assembly, Forty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings, 17th meeting, p. 6)*

Our region wishes to record its gratitude for the results of the political dialogue and economic cooperation between the European Union and its member States, the States of Central America and Panama, and the Group of cooperating countries - Colombia, Mexico and Venezuela - and also for the initiative of the industrialized countries which, with us, make up the forum known as the Partnership for Democracy and Development in Central America.

We are also aware that the operations of the United Nations that have been undertaken in the area, such as the PEC and the International Conference on Central American Refugees (CIREFCA) have yielded many results. But CIREFCA still has to conclude its operational cycle in May 1994, and PEC may meet difficulties in obtaining financial resources to complete its programmes, which will give it new prospects and more time for international cooperation for Central America.

That is why, with a view to making a substantial contribution to the process of transforming our region, Central America is submitting for the General Assembly's consideration draft resolution A/48/L.21, which I have the honour of introducing and in which we set forth new concepts for this recovery and call for support for national and regional actions that have been taken. We wish to consolidate the principal achievements in the quest for

peace, national reconciliation and economic reconstruction and to take up the challenges and problems to be solved with the support of the international community, which has an irreplaceable role to play in Central America. We hope that the Assembly will adopt this draft resolution without a vote.

In conclusion, I should like once again to thank the Secretary-General for his work and the report which he has presented to us on the situation in Central America and which is contained in document A/48/586. We are particularly grateful to those who made it possible for the Special Plan of Economic Cooperation for Central America to be a substantial contribution by our Organization and the international community to Central America.

Much remains to be done, but we have faith and confidence that our efforts and those of the international community will enable us to work together for a better future for the peoples of Central America.

Mr. NOTERDAEME (Belgium) *(interpretation from French)*: I have the honour of speaking on behalf of the European Union in this debate on the situation in Central America, which has begun with the introduction of a draft resolution of which we have become aware only today. In the circumstances, the European Union wishes to make it clear that its statement in the debate will in no way prejudge its position on the draft resolution.

Since the San José Declaration in 1984, the peace processes in Central America have enjoyed substantial support from the European Union. For some years now, they have also been closely followed by the General Assembly.

The overall situation in Central America has improved since the 1980s in terms of democratization, the consolidation of peace, and regional stability and integration. Nevertheless, the Esquipulas Agreements have been implemented in different ways in different countries. Implementation has given rise to tempered optimism or to hope in certain cases; but other situations, where national reconciliation and the consolidation of peace are still out of reach, remain a matter of concern.

Far from discouraging us, the remaining difficulties must strengthen the common determination of the peoples and Governments of the region and of the international community to persist in their efforts. I should like to pay a tribute to the Governments and political leaders of Central American countries that have exhibited the vision that is indispensable if their peoples are to move forward on the path of peace, development and democracy.

Although still fragile, the decisive progress in the Salvadorian peace process is one of the remarkable achievements in which our Organization can take pride. I should like to congratulate the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador (ONUSAL) and its personnel on the positive results they have achieved so far in the restoration of peace in El Salvador.

The European Union is determined to continue to play its full role both within the framework of the political dialogue with the Central American countries and in terms of cooperation. We must nevertheless recall that the solution to remaining conflicts must come from the Central Americans themselves.

Armed conflict in El Salvador is now a thing of the past. We must welcome this success for peace, which we owe to the realism displayed by both parties and to the efforts of the international community and, in particular, the United Nations. The European Union has lent its unswerving support to the implementation of the Peace Accords and continues to stress respect for all their parts. We welcome the measures taken by the Government to implement the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Commission on the Purification of the Armed Forces, to reduce the size of the army, and to demobilize the Frente Farabundo Marti para la Liberación Nacional (FMLN) and transform it into a political party.

Despite such undeniable progress, recent developments in El Salvador have aroused concern. As the beginning of the electoral campaign approaches, the intensification of political violence, noted in the latest report of the Human Rights Division of ONUSAL, and the resurgence of illegal armed groups, noted in the latest report of the Secretary-General on the recommendations of the Commission on the Truth, remind us of the continued fragility of the process for the peaceful settlement of the Salvadorian crisis. On 28 October, the European Union expressed its concern at the resurgence of political violence and asked President Cristiani to see to it that those responsible for violence are caught and brought to trial.

Recently, the Secretary-General stressed the importance of making up for the delay that has occurred in the implementation of the recommendations of the Commission on the Truth. He also stressed the need to respect the Peace Accords. In order to break the vicious circle of violence, he called for the rapid establishment of the machinery for investigating illegal armed groups, and the establishment of the national Civil Police and the land-transfer programme. In his statement of 5 November, the President of the Security Council supported the Secretary-General's recommendations.

The European Union attaches particular importance to the implementation of the recommendations of the Commission on the Truth. The European Union, which has contributed through substantial action to the reinsertion of former combatants into the agricultural sphere, also wishes to see the problems related to land distribution solved. Similarly, the new national Civil Police must receive the necessary resources to perform its task efficiently. The European Union is now studying the matter of what resources it can use to help the new Civil Police Academy.

Serious efforts are still required before the human rights situation will be satisfactory. In particular, an end should be put to ordinary violence that may conceal political motives.

Finally, all progress achieved must be confirmed by a properly conducted electoral process. The elections next March will be a decisive test of the peace process. The impartiality of the bodies responsible for the proper conduct of the elections, broad participation in the elections, and the peaceful acceptance of the voters' choice will be the criteria for success. Following up the efforts it has already made in regard to the preparations for the electoral process, the European Union is now actively considering an assistance project aimed at contributing to the training of the personnel responsible for the proper conduct of the elections. ONUSAL, whose mandate has been expanded to include observation of the elections, will make a valuable contribution to the electoral process.

Having condemned the suspension of constitutional order in Guatemala, the European Union welcomed its peaceful restoration and expressed its support for President de León Carpio.

We earnestly hope that the President of Guatemala will succeed in consolidating democratic institutions and the dominance of civilian authority. We note his proposal to promote national dialogue and solve the most severe social problems, but we are concerned that the proposal does not yet enjoy the support of all segments of society and we call on all parties concerned to show flexibility by permitting the broadest possible participation in the political and social process. We hope too that resumed peace negotiations will rapidly end this, the oldest, armed conflict in Central America, and will bring about profound political and social reforms.

We welcome the fact that both the Government of Guatemala and the Unidad Revolucionaria Nacional Guatemalteca (URNG) have requested the Secretary-General's help in facilitating the resumption of dialogue. In that connection, we support the efforts of the Secretary-General to promote that dialogue. The European Union reiterates the great importance it attaches to significant improvement in the human rights situation and, in particular, in efforts to punish the guilty.

The European Union is pleased that Guatemala has affirmed its recognition of Belize, and hopes that those two countries will continue to improve their relations and settle their territorial dispute once and for all.

Turning to Nicaragua, the European Union notes with concern the deterioration of the situation in that country. Despite the amnesty declared by the Government, the situation of demobilized personnel has not led to true peace.

We reiterate our firm support for President Chamorro's efforts to promote dialogue and national reconciliation and to assure civilian control over the army. We call on all political forces to respect their commitment not to turn to political violence, to overcome their differences and to make the necessary effort to implement a plan for national reconciliation placing the higher interests of the country above political antagonisms. The support the European Union has given for many years to the Central American peace process and the significant assistance it provides to Nicaragua in that framework entitle the Union to issue this appeal - by which it intends no interference - to the political groupings in Nicaragua. While the international community is continuing its efforts to contribute to the process of national reconciliation, the primary responsibility for this still belongs to the Nicaraguans.

We hope the mediation efforts of the Central American Presidents and the Organization of American States (OAS) will make it possible very shortly to achieve a true national agreement.

Another priority concern of the European Union with respect to Central America is human rights. There can be no lasting economic development or political stability without human rights guarantees.

The efforts of the European Union in this sphere are also reflected in its support for many practical projects relating to democratization and human rights. We share the gratification of our Central American partners at the fact that the multi-year programme for the promotion of human rights, solemnly launched at the Lisbon conference in February 1992 by the European Union and the countries of Central America, has come up to speed. That programme joins many other endeavours in support of democratization, electoral processes in particular.

The European Union has continued its efforts for the reintegration of refugees and displaced or demobilized persons, particularly with respect to El Salvador and Nicaragua, and for the return of Guatemalan refugees.

To support the fight of these countries against drug trafficking, the European Union has provided Central American countries with trading facilities in the European market.

The European Union reaffirms its determination to cooperate with the Central American countries in their efforts to protect the environment and restore ecological balance.

The European Union also welcomes the resumption of the integration process, marked by the implementation of the Central American Integration System and the establishment of the Central American parliament, which it supports.

We have noted with interest initiatives such as the Caracas Commitment and the Caracas Statement issued by the Central American countries and the Group of Three to promote cooperation and trade.

The implementation of the San Salvador Agreement between the European Union and Central America, signed at the ninth San José ministerial meeting, held in El Salvador in February 1993, marks a new stage in relations between the two regions and opens the way for continued and intensified Community cooperation. I would recall that the European Union is the largest provider of assistance to the region.

Next year we mark the tenth anniversary of our dialogue with Central America, a dialogue through which we have striven to support the peace processes, both politically and in terms of cooperation. The progress is encouraging, but firm support from us and from the international community at large remains indispensable. The European Union vigorously reaffirms its commitment to promote peace, democracy and development in Central America.

Mr. HATANO (Japan): The Central American peace process has made remarkable progress in the past six years, since the Esquipulas Agreements were concluded. The peoples of El Salvador, Guatemala and Nicaragua have demonstrated an unshakeable determination to overcome decades of violence, repression and deprivation. Their progress towards reconciliation and reconstruction, bolstered by the initiatives of like-minded countries, has demonstrated that peace-keeping and peacemaking efforts may be effectively combined. Indeed, I believe the experience in Central America can serve as a model for similar endeavours in other regions.

Decades of conflict and mistrust cannot be forgotten overnight, and numerous obstacles remain on the path to lasting peace. Japan has various concerns about the situation in the region, and I would like to touch on them very briefly.

First, in El Salvador, the signing of the Chapultepec Agreement by the Government and the Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front (FMLN) in January of last year formally ended the armed conflict and marked a turning-point for both the country and the region. Japan warmly applauded the good-faith efforts made by both sides in the negotiating process. Recently, however, violence has once again erupted in El Salvador, prompting the Security Council to call for a thorough and prompt investigation and to reaffirm the importance of the full and timely implementation of all the provisions of the peace agreement. Japan remains concerned about delays in implementing the agreement, but recognizes that the development of mutual trust will require time, patience and much wisdom. Japan trusts that both sides will recognize the need to adhere to a definite timetable, and that they will overcome their remaining difficulties in a peaceful manner.

Japan regards the forthcoming election in El Salvador as the culmination of the entire peace process, and hopes that the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador (ONUSAL), which is playing a key role in that process, will ensure the credibility of that election. This is essential to the establishment of lasting peace and stability.

I turn now to Guatemala. Japan welcomed the inauguration of Mr. Ramiro de León Carpio as that country's new President, democratically elected following the partial suspension of the Constitution by the former President last May. We hope the negotiations between the Government and the Guatemalan National Revolutionary Union will be resumed promptly so as to strengthen the stability of the country.

With regard to Nicaragua, Japan has welcomed the efforts made by President Chamorro towards political reconciliation, even as she has had to cope with the difficulties of presiding over a divided Congress. Recalling the crisis that occurred last August, Japan hopes that all political and social divisions within Nicaragua will be overcome through negotiations - for example, through the national tripartite dialogue between the Nicaraguan Government, the FSLN and the UNO - and that further progress will be made in the democratization efforts, including civilian control of the armed forces. Japan

outlined its concerns about the situation in Nicaragua more fully in its statement on agenda item 45, "International assistance for the rehabilitation and reconstruction of Nicaragua", at the current session.

Although genuine progress has been made in the establishment of peace and stability throughout Central America, serious difficulties still remain. But, rather than allowing ourselves to become discouraged by these difficulties, we should be challenged to resolve them by combining peace-keeping and peace-building efforts in new and creative ways.

In this context, Japan is extending various kinds of medium- and long-term cooperation, including yen loans, general grant aid and technical cooperation, to the countries in the region. In addition, it provides emergency assistance to the people of Central America at times of natural disasters. We hope that this development and humanitarian assistance will also help to advance the peace process and ensure that it is irreversible.

In addition to bilateral assistance, intra-regional cooperation is also important. Japan has been actively participating in various activities of the Partnership for Democracy and Development in Central America ever since it was established. Japan also serves as Co-Chairman of the Working Group on Economic Development, and presided over the Central American ministerial meeting last March in Tokyo. The success of the meeting was reflective of the progress that has been made in the peace process throughout the region. Japan will continue to support, in these and other forums, the initiatives of the nations of Central America.

In closing, I would like to note that the Secretary-General, who has played an important role in restoring peace and stability to Central America, deserves our admiration and strengthened support. I wish to emphasize that both the General Assembly and the Security Council should follow the situation in Central America very closely, with a view to applying the concept of peace-building in its most innovative sense. We hope that our experience in the region will spur further United Nations efforts to pursue peace-keeping, peacemaking and peace-building in other parts of the world. Japan is among the many nations that vigorously support this expansion of the United Nations role on behalf of world peace.

Mr. BIVERO (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Venezuela attaches particular importance to the item on the situation in Central America, because of its traditional ties of friendship and solidarity with all the countries of the area, and because of its permanent commitment to seeking solutions to the serious political, economic and social difficulties that those countries have had to face, to the serious detriment of their development processes.

Today, as the Secretary-General stresses, the region is firmly committed to a process of consolidating peace, which generally has reached a level of significant stability. The international community has been involved in this progress, supporting the processes of national peace and reconciliation as well as those of economic reconstruction and recovery, which are closely linked to them.

Venezuela, both individually and together with other countries with particular links to, and interests in, the region, will continue to support these processes, politically as well as economically. We have always been careful to respect the will of the Central American countries themselves, being convinced that the consolidation of peace and the promotion of development in the region will be more stable and long-lasting the more they respond to the convictions of those countries. This is an appropriate occasion to express our gratitude and admiration for the constant efforts of the Central American countries to identify and promote their own priorities in an exercise of affirmation that deserves the support of the entire international community.

Venezuela recognizes the particular characteristics of each national political policy process in Central America as well as the obstacles facing them. We will continue to be as objective as possible, with continuing support for the Secretary-General's good offices and for the will of the parties that have placed their trust in them. We are pleased with the progress described in the Secretary-General's report in this regard, and we note its assessments of the stage reached in each of these political processes of peace and national reconciliation. Venezuela will continue to work with them, as a friendly country, in the search for and the promotion of progress.

In the area of economic cooperation, as the Secretary-General's report also indicates, Venezuela has endeavoured to contribute to the reactivation of the Central American economies and the strengthening of ties of interdependence. It has done so both individually and with other countries of the area, in particular Colombia and Mexico, with which it forms the Group of Three.

I should like in this respect to highlight the signing on 12 February 1993, the signing of the Caracas Commitment, which established a new framework for cooperation between the Group of Three and the Central American region, as well as the Caracas Statement which renews the Group's commitment to create a free trade zone.

Yesterday we took part in the first international technical meeting on Central America. Here I should mention that Venezuela supports the Central American countries' initiative - they were represented in the technical meeting at ministerial level - to begin working towards an international conference for peace and development in Central America that would enable them to consolidate the progress in these areas that has been achieved so far, and to lay down sound foundations for multilateral cooperation in future.

In conclusion, I wish to offer our wholehearted support for the conclusions of the Secretary-General's report, which says that Central America has emerged from the difficult decade of the 1980s with a dynamic institutional framework, a comprehensive social and economic agenda and an active and constructive partnership with the international community, which will undoubtedly make it possible for Central America to continue to rely on international solidarity and to make use of it for the benefit of its peoples. Venezuela supports the United Nations continuing interest in, and support for, this process. We are sure that the General Assembly will ratify its collective commitment to peace, democracy and development in Central America.

Mr. OSVALD (Sweden): Over the last few years developments in Central America have been, by and large, very encouraging. The wind of democracy has swept away authoritarian regimes. Almost everywhere, war and conflict have given way to peace and reconciliation. There are now genuine prospects for dealing constructively with the economic and social injustices that have always been the roots of the conflicts in the region.

Since the outset, Sweden has actively supported the peace process in Central America. We shall continue to do so.

The objective of our political and economic endeavours in the region has always been to contribute to the promotion of peace, reconciliation, democracy and respect for human rights. In addition, Sweden supports economic reforms aiming at growth, increased trade and investment and a more equitable distribution of income favouring the poorest groups of the population, in so far as these objectives are part of the development efforts of the Central American countries and their commitments towards human rights and environmental protection.

Sweden has had programmes for development cooperation in Central America for more than 10 years. On average, our yearly contribution to the region for development projects and humanitarian assistance has been $115 million. This includes assistance under bilateral agreements, through the United Nations, or through regional as well as non-governmental organizations.

Sweden strongly supports the ongoing regional integration efforts in Central America. Such regional cooperation is, in our view, crucial for stability and democracy in the region.

The International Conference on Central American Refugees (CIREFCA) process is a good example of what can be achieved through internationally supported regional cooperation. We support and are carefully monitoring joint efforts by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the United Nations Development Programme to find a modality for giving continuation to the major aspects of the CIREFCA process after its conclusion in April 1994.

Sweden wholeheartedly supports the United Nations activities in Central America. As the peace process continues, we hope that these efforts can be expanded. The importance of the international community's political and economic support for Central America cannot be overestimated.

The progress made in the peace process in El Salvador is promising. The parties themselves and the United Nations through the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador (ONUSAL), have been the main contributors to this positive development. We consider it essential that ONUSAL should be able to continue its task and to support the peace process until the situation in El Salvador has been firmly consolidated. The will for peace and the courage and the willingness of the parties to compromise have made it possible to find solutions to many difficult and sensitive problems.

Sweden notes with satisfaction that many of the recommendations of the Commission on the Truth have now been implemented. We share the view of the Secretary-General that the remaining recommendations - especially those concerning reform of the judicial system, investigation of the activities of illegal groups and the ban on holding public office placed on individuals mentioned in the Commission's report - should be implemented before the start of the election campaign. The time between now and the elections in March next year will be of crucial importance. One of the main tasks must be to speed up voter registration and make it as comprehensive as possible. This is necessary to ensure the credibility of the election process.

Furthermore, the peace agreements must be fully implemented in order to promote a favourable political atmosphere. We are therefore concerned about the delays

with regard to the creation of the new civilian police, the reintegration of former soldiers and ex-FMLN combatants into civilian society, and the redistribution of land.

Recent acts of violence, notably the assassination of FMLN leaders, is another cause of grave concern to Sweden. We expect these acts to be promptly investigated and the guilty brought to justice.

It is of great importance that the international community should contribute by all means available to the realization of free and fair elections in El Salvador. Sweden has already stated its willingness to engage in the process by providing personnel, both in the preparatory phase of the elections and as election observers. In addition, Sweden has decided to allocate $7.5 million yearly over a period of three years, in part for the election process and in part for the successful installation of a new national civilian police force.

Sweden salutes the victory of the democratic and civilian forces in Guatemala earlier this year. We have strong reasons to hope that President Ramiro de León Carpio will continue the democratization and will vigorously promote respect for human rights. The early resumption of the peace negotiations between the Government of Guatemala and the URNG would make a crucial contribution to the consolidation of democracy and national reconciliation. President Ramiro de León Carpio has taken steps to help reactivate the negotiations.

In Sweden's view, an increased role for the United Nations in the negotiations in Guatemala may be of benefit to the peace process in Guatemala as a whole. We welcome the fact that both the Government and the URNG have expressed interest in a United Nations involvement.

Sweden will continue to follow the peace process in Guatemala closely. We are prepared to contribute to the process, provided the parties agree that this would be constructive.

We are still concerned about the human rights situation in Guatemala. A breakthrough in the peace negotiations is, in our view, likely to have a positive impact in this field. A separate, internationally verified agreement between the two parties on human rights issues would enhance the prospects for peace. Sweden provides assistance to Guatemala in areas such as human rights, and we are prepared to make additional efforts in this regard.

The agreement regarding repatriation of refugees, signed a year ago by the Guatemalan Government and representatives of the Guatemalan refugees, is unique and merits respect from all parties involved. It is important that this agreement be carried out as stipulated. Sweden will continue to monitor and support the implementation of the agreement, and we are encouraged by the recent reports in this regard.

The path towards mutual understanding and national reconciliation chosen by the Government of Nicaragua has our full support. However, the political basis for this endeavour must be broadened.

Sweden is aware of the difficult economic problems that the Nicaraguan leadership is confronting today. The continuation of Sweden's programme for development cooperation, amounting to $35 million during the current fiscal year, is a recognition of this fact.

Our objectives are firm. One aim of our assistance is to support Nicaragua's own efforts towards national reconciliation and a strengthening of democracy. Another is to promote the Nicaraguan programmes for economic stabilization and growth. Only through a consistent donor policy will we be able to maintain confidence in our programme for development cooperation with Nicaragua. However, when required, we have made the necessary modifications to our policy, and we urge other donor countries to show flexibility.

Sweden is of the view that the acute crisis in Nicaragua is basically political in nature. A national consensus must be reached on a number of fundamental political issues in order to create the conditions for a comprehensive approach to Nicaragua's problems, economic as well as political.

The national dialogue has to continue and must lead to a concrete agreement, in particular on questions of ownership and access to land, reform of the judicial system and transformation of the army and the police.

The parties in Nicaragua have a joint responsibility for setting their country on a stable political and economic track. This would be the best way to attract foreign cooperation.

We have previously stated that Sweden is prepared to take part, together with the United Nations and other members of the international community, in international efforts to contribute to the finding of solutions to the serious political problems that are hampering Nicaragua's development. This is, of course, subject to the existence of broad support among the parties in Nicaragua for such an endeavour.

In spite of all the difficult issues that remain to be solved, there are reasons for optimism as concerns

developments in Central America. Fortunately, the internal and regional problems that we see today can be approached on their own terms now that our vision is no longer clouded by the perceptions of the cold-war era.

Peace, reconciliation, democracy, justice, respect for human rights and economic development are at the top of the agenda. It is not only the duty but also in the interest of the international community to give its full support to the achievement of these goals in Central America.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to propose, if there is no objection, that the list of speakers in the debate on this item be now closed.

It was so decided.

Mr. SOMAVIA (Chile) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: The report of the Secretary-General on the item before us today, "The situation in Central America: procedures for the establishment of a firm and lasting peace and progress in fashioning a region of peace, freedom, democracy and development" (A/48/586), points out in paragraph 2 that, for a decade now, the United Nations has been assisting the peace process in Central America.

The report then goes on to remind us that the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Secretariat itself have participated actively in that process, the success of which, according to the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, led to a significant economic reactivation in 1992, owing to a great extent to internal demand. The report adds:

> "The transition from confrontation to consensus in intergovernmental relations has generated increased cooperation on a large number of issues. It has rekindled the thrust towards regional integration, with concrete results particularly in the area of trade." *(A/48/586, para. 5)*

The report states also:

> "The economic gains mentioned above must be consolidated against a background of world recession, decline in the price of traditional exports and growing difficulties for some export products to enter foreign markets." *(A/48/586, para. 7)*

On the other hand, the analysis before us recalls, too, that:

> "... many of the structural causes of the acute crisis suffered in the 1980s are still present. Social disparities remain a source of tensions. With regard to health care, housing, education and employment, the region's indicators continue to be a cause for concern. Across the region, extreme poverty has been on the increase in recent years. In addition, new challenges have emerged, such as drug trafficking and environmental degradation." *(A/48/586, para. 7)*

The report also notes:

> "In that context, Central American Governments have continued to stress the interrelationship between the goals of peace, freedom, democracy and development." *(A/48/586, para. 9)*

For Chile, the action that has been carried out in recent years by the Central American nations is truly exemplary. It serves as an example of the ability to innovate in the face of difficulties that had appeared insurmountable; an example of how to develop new concepts of security; an example of how to shoulder one's own problems with imagination, courage and resoluteness; and an example, too, of how peoples have been able to defend their political and human rights.

The Central American countries have been true leaders in the area of agreements for peace and political cooperation, and we should recognize that their attainments are no less important than the achievements in the Middle East and in South Africa. But these achievements require consolidation. The situation is not easy and stability is still fragile, hence the need for continued use of United Nations machinery at this new stage in the quest for a strengthening of peace, freedom, democracy and development - four terms that are synonymous with what Central America sees as its own destiny today. In this process, particular importance should be attached, in our view, to the players and institutions of civil society.

Another aspect of great importance to us is the fact that Central America has continued to believe in the United Nations, even at a time when - at the beginning of the 10 years of United Nations presence in the area, in a strictly political sense - the Organization was under scrutiny because of its apparent lack of effectiveness. With the determination of the usefulness of international action channeled through the United Nations, the validity and force of our Organization were demonstrated also. But demonstration of this validity should continue above and beyond peace-keeping operations, because - as we have so often reiterated in this forum when these topics are discussed at the United Nations - there can be no peace without development, just as there can be no development without peace.

Central America is an example that cannot be cast aside. It cannot be ignored, because the best examples cannot be cast aside. It is precisely because there are difficulties, obstacles and complexities - which have even required decisions by various United Nations bodies - that support must be reinforced. For this reason, the convening of a conference on peace and development in Central America is of great importance. Both this conference and the draft resolution (A/48/L.21), before us deserve our full support.

This Monday, there began, in Puntarenas, Costa Rica, a Latin American meeting dealing with the social aspects of regional cooperation. Various bodies entrusted with programmes relating to development and social investments are meeting there, with the objective of strengthening a continent-wide network for the exchange of experiences on these topics. Chile is participating in that exercise in the same spirit as that in which it is making this statement: with a deep commitment to working together within Latin America and the Caribbean, and with the objective of keeping alive the duty of international solidarity, of which Central America has shown itself to be deserving.

My country has been developing, in so far as its means permit, a programme of cooperation with Central America. In addition to our present participation in the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador, we have since 1990 been carrying out various projects within the framework of a *rapprochement* with an area to which Chile attaches particular importance - not only because of historical ties but because, for us, this is not a case of solidarity with the problems of others. Rather, it is an opportunity for support, backing and commitment in a situation that is ours as well.

Consistent with our sense of integration with Latin America and the Caribbean, we accept wholly and permanently the realities of the region. Last week in San Pedro Sula, Honduras, Chile and the countries of Central America made a first general evaluation of this endeavour, with very encouraging results.

But, above and beyond our individual contribution, which, as I have mentioned, is necessarily limited, we believe that the countries of the developed world and the multilateral bodies must maintain their interest in Central America, despite the internal problems the cooperating countries are experiencing. We are aware that "development fatigue" is coming to be felt in certain parts of the developed world, but we believe that it is possible to optimize the use of resources and carry out efforts to achieve greater efficiency. None the less, the most important thing is to understand that the Governments and the civil societies of the Central American countries cannot do everything on their own. They have already made great sacrifices, and they deserve an integrated response from the international community. That is the political meaning of what we are discussing here today in the General Assembly.

In that spirit, the Rio Group, at its meeting in Santiago, Chile, some weeks ago lent support to a particular situation - that of Nicaragua - in order to deal with the problems that country is facing at this juncture.

I should like to conclude by pointing out that the prospects for Central America to become definitively a zone of peace, freedom, democracy and development are very good. Let us not allow this opportunity to slip through our fingers.

Mr. CÁRDENAS (Argentina) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: My delegation is pleased to participate in this debate on the situation in Central America, to which we attach special importance. We have carefully analysed the report (A/48/586) of the Secretary-General, and we share many of its affirmations and conclusions.

The situation in the Central American region is, of course, no exception to the global trends emerging since the end of the cold war or to the concrete manifestations we have seen in the world in the course of efforts to attain the goals of peace, freedom, democracy and development. The quest for these interrelated goals will contribute to the consolidation of well-being and stability in the region.

The international community must be aware that the Central American region is emerging from a difficult period of internal conflicts and is entering a new stage of institutional reconstruction and economic development. However, the advancement of this process requires the solidarity and cooperation of all other countries, which can guide the process while taking into account, *inter alia*, the following urgent matters: the need for bilateral and multilateral financial support able to stimulate investment and, in consequence, growth; the reduction, partial forgiveness and/or conversion of external debt; and the need to prevent the continued suffering of some countries of the region because of the adverse consequences of protectionist commercial policies, especially those that, with devastating results, affect their traditional agricultural exports, hampering exports and disturbing the commercial flows of commodities. We are referring, of course, to the same policies that the Cairns Group has been denouncing during the lengthy Uruguay Round of negotiations.

In the context of assistance for sustainable development, we cannot ignore the fundamental importance

of providing suitable international cooperation in the processes of democratic consolidation and of continuously pouring in the economic and technical assistance indispensable to facing and surmounting the trying sequels of violent conflicts. International responsibility does not stop, of course, at settling crises of war, but must be shouldered, in peacetime, through the institutional, economic, social and cultural reconstruction of the countries involved.

My country is clearly committed to this philosophy, as it has shown in concrete fashion in peace processes; in such recent initiatives as the signing of conventions for technical cooperation in the fields of human resources, agriculture, forest management, fishing, energy and, in particular, the renegotiation of external public debt; and through its military and civilian participation in the peace-keeping operations of the region. We have also made, and continue to make, concrete contributions in human rights, assistance in elections and related matters.

In this spirit we reaffirm our commitment to the Central American region, whose peoples share such close bonds of fraternity with our own.

Mrs. JAGAN (Guyana): It is with a deep sense of satisfaction that I take the opportunity to speak on agenda item 40 - "The situation in Central America: procedures for the establishment of a firm and lasting peace and progress in fashioning a region of peace, freedom, democracy and development".

I say this because it was but one short year ago that we in Guyana, after a period in which there were four rigged elections, experienced the return of participatory democracy, through the free expression of the will of the electorate. The result of this was a change of government after 28 years. Democracy has been an ideal which the people of Guyana and, no doubt, most people the world over cherish dearly. It is therefore our sincere hope that the opportunity afforded to the Guyana electorate for free and fair elections can be afforded in other countries where people are still clamouring for the right to self-determination and the right of a free expression of choice in regular, transparent polls. Peace, freedom, democracy and development are ideals cherished by all right-thinking men and women of the world.

The quest for democracy in Central America is qualitatively no different from that in other regions. We have in recent years witnessed the organization and conduct of elections in countries such as Nicaragua and El Salvador. These elections have been preceded by an elaborate plan of voter education, voter registration and other measures taken for the institutional strengthening of the whole democratic process. The role of the United Nations in this preparatory process must be highly commended. Its observer missions to monitor the actual conduct of the balloting and the counting of the ballots have provided the additional element of international supervision, thereby further strengthening the expression of the will of the people.

It remains the case, however, that the institutional strengthening of the electoral process and the holding of democratic elections are not ends in and of themselves, but, rather, the underpinnings of a climate of confidence in which the electorate can exist. We have seen, therefore, that there is still work to be done, both domestically and through international and regional organizations.

One way to promote peace, freedom, democracy and development in Central America is the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador (ONUSAL). This Mission has served to create the objective conditions for enhancing the prospects of economic and social development in that country. It has played a pivotal role in organizing and reinvigorating institutional mechanisms for the orderly conduct of the State's internal affairs. Thus the civil administrative structure - the police, the judiciary, the court system - have all been addressed in the interest of the preservation of democracy. The Government of Guyana was pleased to be in a position to offer a small contingent of members of its police force to perform the role of Civilian Police Monitors in El Salvador's transition process.

The international community must be vigilant against any attempt, as evidenced by recent events in that country, to frustrate consolidation of democracy.

I hasten to add that it would be unfortunate if we were to discuss the concepts of peace, freedom, democracy and development in Central America while confining our comments to a single State. Peace and stability have a regional connotation as well as on international one. Indeed, in the past situations of internal political unrest and violence have not gone unnoticed by the international community because of their potential threat to international tranquility. We should therefore applaud the efforts to return El Salvador to the fold of democratic Central American States, while recognizing that more needs to be done internally and that the precedents set by countries like Nicaragua are exemplary.

The Guyana delegation believes that the return to acceptable minimum standards of protection of human rights is essential to the return of peace and stability in Central America. Access to the courts, the right to a fair trial and recourse to the remedies of *habeas corpus* and

amparo are paramount. Moreover, the establishment of measures for the promotion and protection of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights is the *sine qua non* for the establishment of a region of peace, freedom, democracy and development.

The international community, and developing countries in particular, have agonized for years over the question of whether democracy should of necessity precede development or whether development should be sustained while the democratic traditions of a State are either held in abeyance or otherwise lag behind comparative global norms. This debate was in a sense circular, since the institution of democracy is a political concern while development is more of an economic concern. But in reality the two concepts are inextricably intertwined: an improvement in statistical indicators such as gross domestic product (GDP), in the absence of political and social conditions which allow people to improve the quality of their lives in a holistic sense, is short-lived if not counter-productive. The overwhelming body of opinion now is that democracy and development enjoy a symbiotic relationship and that quality of life indicators can no longer solely be economic statistics but must also reflect the fundamental rights and freedoms of the electorate.

While taking note of the qualitative improvement of democratic traditions not only in El Salvador, through the work *inter alia* of ONUSAL, but also in Central America as a whole, we must ensure that respect for human rights is complementary to economic and social development in order to achieve lasting and stable peace within the region. We in Guyana cherish these ideals, and we therefore pledge our support for their promotion, in the overall aim of maintaining international peace and security. Consequently, the Guyana delegation will support draft resolution A/48/L.21.

Mr. TELLO (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Government of Mexico has been closely following developments in Central America. Although the period of conflicts and confrontations seems finally to be behind us, we must recognize that progress has been uneven. Important progress has been made in adopting measures for dialogue and reconciliation. We can also note a strengthening of the institutional and democratic structures and a more dynamic evolution of the subregional process of harmonization and cooperation.

At the same time, new uncertainties and contradictions have arisen. New challenges to the definitive consolidation of peace, reconciliation and development have been added to old but persistent problems. Today more than ever it is vital that we redouble our efforts to realize the hope of the Presidents of the Central American countries that the region become one of peace, freedom, democracy and development.

The consolidation of a stable and lasting peace can be achieved only if there is progress in economic and social development. Peace and development are indissolubly linked. Hence, political, institutional and democratic progress must be accompanied by the capacity to raise the standards and quality of life of the region's inhabitants.

I should now like to discuss the efforts made by the Government and the society of El Salvador to carry out the Peace Agreements. Various aspects of the process formally initiated on 16 January 1992 have been implemented satisfactorily, while in other areas problems and delays remain. We encourage the parties to continue working, through dialogue, towards fulfilling all the commitments.

We cannot but express our deep concern at the unfortunate acts of violence recently observed in El Salvador; they bring new uncertainties to the peace process. The violence must be stopped and the facts relating to it fully brought to light.

We appeal to Salvadorian society to establish the conditions for carrying out the electoral process successfully. This would be the beginning of a new stage in the history of El Salvador. Hence, we are pleased at the signing, on 5 November of this year, of the "Commitment of Six Presidential Candidates to Peace and Stability in El Salvador".

The holding of elections in March 1994, under ONUSAL supervision, will be a decisive step in the process of consolidating peace. However, we must bear in mind that national reconciliation will not be automatic. All sectors of Salvadorian society will have to work daily and continually to consolidate the peace process and to take firm steps towards promoting economic development.

We should like to make special mention of ONUSAL, a key operation in resolving the Salvadorian conflict and implementing the Peace Agreements. We wish to express great appreciation for the difficult, painstaking work carried out by this Mission, which has carried out with dedication and efficiency the task entrusted to it by the Organization.

With respect to Guatemala, we note with satisfaction the restoration of constitutional order there after the events of last May. The process of dialogue should be begun again as quickly as possible, and the negotiations should take fully into account the progress achieved before the interruption of the process.

The people of Nicaragua continue to face the enormous challenge of national reconciliation. We are pleased with the agreement achieved on 21 August between the Government of Nicaragua, the National Opposition Union and the Sandinista National Liberation Front, pledging the removal of all the obstacles to the achievement of institutional, economic and social normalization.

We wish to stress once again the importance of international cooperation with Central America. The international community should continue to support the effort of the Central American countries to make progress towards peace and economic and social development.

Just as there was no major problem in finding financing during the years of armed conflict, the community of nations should now respond, more generously still, to the challenge of strengthening peace in this region.

Mr. SIDOROV (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Russian Federation notes with satisfaction that the positive trends in the Central American region in the settlement of conflicts and crises and the elimination of tension are gathering momentum. It is obvious that the policy of national conciliation through dialogue and negotiation designed to halt violence, strengthen trust and cooperation, ensure respect for human rights, consolidate democratic institutions and create a civil society is yielding appreciable results.

As has been quite rightly pointed out in the report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Central America:

> "The end of the cold war and the end of the armed conflicts which afflicted El Salvador and Nicaragua and affected the region as a whole during the 1980s have generated better prospects for the achievement of the goals of peace, democratization, reconciliation, development and justice ..." (*A/48/586, para. 4*).

The settlement in El Salvador has now entered the delicate phase of preparations for elections, which are designed to be the culmination of the peace process. In this context, we share the profound concern expressed in the letter dated 3 November 1993 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/26689), concerning the situation regarding human rights in El Salvador and, in particular, politically motivated murders and delays in the creation of a national civil police force and in the implementation of the voter registration process. In the presidential statement dated 5 November 1993 (S/26695), the Security Council underlined the importance of full and timely implementation of all the provisions of the Peace Accords. The Council expressed concern about delays in the resolution of a number of problems, particularly the phasing out of the National Police force and the full deployment of the National Civil Police, the implementation of the recommendations of the Commission on the Truth, the transfer of land and the carrying out of other reintegration programmes, which are essential for the development of a solid framework and a new climate for the respect of human rights in El Salvador.

While welcoming the agreements between the Government of El Salvador and the Frente Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional (FMLN) with regard to acceleration of the implementation of the Peace Accords, we would stress that the parties must do their utmost to ensure the irreversibility of democratic reforms based on respect for human rights and the social and economic rebirth of the country with the active support of the international community.

This task of consolidating peace on the basis of democracy and social and economic reforms is entirely in keeping with the goals of the Central American process itself.

Russia intends to continue to extend the necessary support to the work of the Secretary-General and of his representatives, the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador, and is ready to cooperate constructively with the Government of El Salvador, the FMLN and all interested countries in the interests of promoting peace and prosperity in that country.

It is our hope that an overall improvement in the situation in the Central American region will have a positive effect on the situation in Guatemala. The fact that the efforts of the Guatemalan leadership have been stalled for so long now - efforts designed to bring about a normalization of the situation in the country - gives ground for concern to us and to the whole international community. The continuation of the smouldering civil war in that country could in certain circumstances carry with it the danger of destabilization, not only for Guatemala, but for the whole region.

We would also hope that influential circles in Guatemalan society will demonstrate maximum flexibility and readiness to search for mutually acceptable solutions and reasonable compromises. However, we would stress that, given the motivation and the political will on the part of the Guatemalans themselves, a considerable contribution to the creation of favourable conditions for successful negotiations could be provided by a more active tapping of the potential of the United Nations and the Organization of

American States, as well as of the accumulated wealth of experience in overcoming crisis situations in the region. We support the efforts of the Secretary-General in this area.

We note the importance of consistent implementation of decisions of the Central American countries to convert Central America into a region of peace, freedom, democracy and development. The Russian Federation, as a permanent member of the Security Council and a permanent observer at the Organization of American States, is ready to continue cooperating constructively with the States of the region, both bilaterally and multilaterally, in order to promote a successful resolution of the problems they face as well as the total normalization of the situation in the region.

Mrs. FRECHETTE (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): Canada reaffirms its full support for the establishment of a firm and lasting peace in Central America based on freedom, democracy and development. The regional peace process demonstrates the determination of Central Americans, with the assistance of the international community, to resolve the problems afflicting their region. Canada congratulates the Governments of the Central American States, the United Nations and those Member States whose efforts have brought about a negotiated settlement of the civil conflicts in Nicaragua and El Salvador, and whose efforts are aimed at finding peaceful solutions to the ongoing civil conflict in Guatemala.

Canada welcomes the advances made in Central America with a view to settling the political, social and economic problems facing the region. We are optimistic that the Central American Governments' efforts to work together to face these challenges, and in particular their commitment to regional integration, will consolidate the progress already made towards establishing peace in the region. Increasing communication, understanding and cooperation between the Central American States are keys to strengthening the peace process. In this regard we note the summit meeting of the Central American Presidents held at Guatemala City from 27 to 29 October.

In El Salvador considerable progress has been made in implementing the Peace Accords signed in 1992. In this regard we salute the efforts of all the parties in carrying out the Accords. We should also like to pay a tribute to the important role the United Nations, through the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador (ONUSAL), has played and continues to play in the successful fulfilment of this objective. We are disturbed, however, by the apparent resurgence of politically motivated violence and the delays in carrying out certain provisions of the Peace Accords. The Canadian Government welcomes remarks by both the Salvadorian Government and the Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front calling for renewed efforts to implement rapidly all the provisions of the Accords. We urge them to fulfil their obligations in this regard. It is especially important for the democratization process that all Salvadorians work together to ensure that the upcoming electoral campaign and the national elections scheduled for spring 1994 are free and fair.

(spoke in English)

Four years after the negotiated settlement of its civil conflict, Nicaragua has worked hard to overcome the many obstacles to the establishment of peace, democracy and development. The international community is providing significant financial and political support for those efforts. However, the economic situation is difficult and the political environment troublesome. We were especially concerned this year by the resort to violence and intimidation to achieve political ends by groups from both sides of the political spectrum. We welcome and fully support renewed efforts by President Chamorro to work towards political reconciliation in Nicaragua. While assistance from the international community can help, dialogue between political groups in Nicaragua remains the basis for building political stability and establishing the right environment for future prosperity.

Earlier this year the people of Guatemala, with international support, successfully defeated an attempt to thwart constitutional rule in their country, demonstrating a desire for civil society based on the rule of law. However, Central America's oldest armed civil conflict continues unresolved. The Canadian Government calls upon the Government of Guatemala and the Guatemalan National Revolutionary Unity to resume the peace talks suspended this May as soon as possible with a view to ending this harmful confrontation. To this end, Canada welcomes the Secretary-General's efforts, in the framework of his mandate of good offices, to arrange a preliminary meeting in the coming weeks to establish the terms for the continuation of the peace talks.

The international community has played an important role in promoting peace in Central America. The United Nations, the Organization of American States and individual countries have all made significant contributions to help achieve peace, enhance democratic institutions and support economic growth. In this regard we welcome the meeting organized yesterday in New York by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) on international assistance to the region. Canada has been part of this international involvement and remains fully engaged in efforts to build on the advances already made. Despite the

progress, however, these advances are fragile. International involvement can only complement the strength, resolve and courage of the Governments and peoples of Central America themselves, which remain essential to ensuring that the progress already made in establishing lasting peace and stability in the region is further strengthened.

Mr. HUSLID (Norway) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I take this opportunity to express my delegation's appreciation for the Secretary-General's lucid report (A/48/586) on the situation in Central America (A/48/586). The report describes in a precise manner the peace process under way and the efforts to establish a lasting democracy in Central America. The report is particularly useful in regard to the role the United Nations and the international community can play. My delegation has also taken note of the widespread sentiment expressed at the International Technical Meeting on Central America convened yesterday by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) that there continues to be a strong need for active participation by the international community. It is in our opinion a positive aspect of the situation that the countries of Central America remain open to dialogue with the international community.

The situation in Central America is not without encouraging signs of development. Years of conflict and mistrust have given way to agreements that have been signed and implemented, and democratic elections have become the rule rather than the exception. Nevertheless, the picture is still not as clear and positive as one could wish. Certain incidents this year have given some cause for concern. However, we maintain our hope that the positive developments will continue. The reason for our guarded optimism is that we have witnessed agreements worked out by the national political forces in which their obvious mutual interests are reasonably balanced. A clear understanding has emerged that true democracy must prevail and that an end must be put to injustice.

The signature of the Peace Accords in El Salvador in January 1992 initiated a fruitful process of peace-building in that country - a process to which the United Nations has contributed substantially. However, we have learned in recent weeks with deep concern of several politically motivated murders in El Salvador. A return to old practices in El Salvador could put the whole peace process in danger. In order to maintain the positive trends it is important for State institutions to observe the laws scrupulously. They must also demonstrate the authority and responsibility to ensure fair and clean elections in March, with equal voting rights for all Salvadorians.

The United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador (ONUSAL) is an example of the new kind of peace-keeping operation, integrating both military and civil post-conflict peace-building. ONUSAL has an innovative aspect in the way in which it is monitoring the human rights situation, and the experience that it is gaining may later prove useful in other conflict areas. Norway is pleased to have been able to take part in this process through participation in ONUSAL and the training of the new national civilian police force.

I turn to the question of Guatemala. Following the agreements of Oslo, Quéretaro and Mexico City, continuous efforts have been made to end the conflict in Guatemala through negotiations. The talks have been difficult and complex, but the parties involved have shown a constructive attitude. Unfortunately, these peace talks have been stalled since the beginning of the year.

It is therefore encouraging that last week the Government of Guatemala and the *Unidad Revolucionaria Nacional Guatemalteca* (URNG) requested the Secretary-General to arrange a preliminary meeting between the two parties, to establish terms for continuing the peace talks. We believe that the Secretary-General and his staff have an excellent basis for carrying out that task. They can build on the experience acquired by the United Nations in the region, and the Secretary-General can suggest methods by which the United Nations, in cooperation with regional organizations, could assist. My country pledges its full support for these efforts, by, *inter alia*, participation in the Group of Friends of Guatemala.

The human rights situation in Guatemala remains a source of concern to us. There seems to be a need for more efficient processes of secure human rights for all sectors of the population. It is the responsibility of the Government to safeguard human rights. However, the international community should be prepared to help, if requested. We hope that ways and means of improving the human rights situation will be given the highest priority in renewed talks between the Government and the URNG.

With regard to the political process in Nicaragua, there is still a need for greater efforts to achieve a national consensus. It is urgent that a more stable basis for constructive talks between the President, the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional (FSLN) and the Unión Nacional Opositora (UNO) be found. The dialogue has been disrupted by violence, and some armed groups have still not demobilized as agreed. However, only through political dialogue will it be possible to address the serious social and economic problems facing Nicaragua. For the good of the nation, all parties must be prepared to compromise. The current situation in the country is

causing hardship and disillusionment among the population.

The situation calls for renewed efforts by the international community to generate sustainable and healthy economic development. Stable economic growth for the benefit of the people can be achieved only in conditions of political stability, whose creation is the shared responsibility of all Nicaragua's political forces. Such conditions are a prerequisite for long-term investment and lasting trade relations, and they also make possible a more efficient use of development assistance. It must be stressed, however, that development assistance by itself - without a propitious political climate - is not sufficient to guarantee improved living conditions in the long run.

Norway is prepared, financially and otherwise, to maintain its support for the determined efforts of the Government of Nicaragua to secure peace and economic development, for the benefit of the people of that country.

Mr. LAING (Belize): Belize is happy to speak in support of the draft resolution sponsored by the other six countries of Central America.

The draft resolution quite correctly deals organically with the integrated issues of peace and reconciliation, the environment and sustainable development, the strengthening of democratic institutions, domestic tranquillity and negotiations, international cooperation and the key principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter. These are all concerns of every Member of the Assembly, which will undoubtedly give the draft resolution consensus support. Certainly, it has the unreserved support of Belize, consistent with my country's long involvement with the organic problems of the isthmus where Belize is located.

In the field of the prevention of epidemic and other diseases, Belize services communities across the borders with its neighbours. Belize, whose population is about 200,000, has provided a safe haven for well over 20,000 refugees, even though it is an onerous burden. Of course, the refugees are from Central America.

As noted in the Secretary-General's report (A/48/586, para. 12), Belize has taken certain initiatives to establish a meaningful regional dialogue on such pressing issues as narcotic drugs. As a bastion of democracy, human rights and justice, Belize provides some comfort to peoples elsewhere who strive for fulfilment of the basic values for which the Organization stands. Above all, Belize is a full partner - we would hope a pivotal partner - in the exercise of building bridges between our other economic subregion, the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), and historical Central America. This Central America-CARICOM forum is now widening the economic spaces of our two subregions, which are now searching together for a fuller life for their peoples.

This expansion and cooperation are due in no small measure to a recognition by Guatemala of the independence and sovereignty of Belize. As this recognition takes hold in the body politic of Guatemala, we look forward to the rapid resolution of a difference which persists because of an unfortunate legacy from the past.

The nagging problems with which the Assembly deals are largely attributable to history. Under this rubric, subjectivities get transmuted into plausible incipient objectivities. We are therefore grateful that the new Central American leaders are persons of wisdom and intellectual vigour. They eschew subjective historicity. As they reinvigorate democratic institutions and reduce violence they demonstrate a refreshing modernity. As they put forward proposals such as a new organic model for security they show that they wish Central America to regain its true, ancient, natural order, the order of the indigenous peoples.

Belize salutes this new leadership. As it does so, we must state our eagerness to participate fully in these new special plans, these new international conferences and these new initiatives. In all of them, Belize will willingly, and gratefully receive its fair share as a good neighbour. At the same time, good friends and neighbours in Central America continue to expect from Belize at least as much as it receives, to the greater glory of the Caribbean and of Central America.

The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item.

I should like to inform members that the Assembly will take action on draft resolution A/48/L.21 on Monday, 22 November, in the morning.

AGENDA ITEM 7

NOTIFICATION BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL UNDER ARTICLE 12, PARAGRAPH 2, OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS: NOTE BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/48/411 AND Add.1)

THE PRESIDENT: May I take it that the General Assembly takes note of document A/48/411 and Add.l.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 7?

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 8 *(continued)*

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK: EIGHTH REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE (A/48/250/Add.7)

The PRESIDENT: I draw the attention of representatives to the eighth report of the General Committee, document A/48/250/Add.7, concerning requests submitted by the Secretary-General for the inclusion in the agenda of two additional items, as well as a request submitted by Algeria for the inclusion in the agenda of an additional item.

In paragraph 1 (a) of the report, the General Committee recommends the inclusion in the agenda of the current session of an additional item entitled "Financing of the United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda".

May I take it that the Assembly decides to include that additional item in its agenda?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: In paragraph 1 (b) of the report, the General Committee also recommends to the Assembly that this item should be allocated to the Fifth Committee.

May I take it that the Assembly adopts this recommendation?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: Next I should like to draw the attention of representatives to paragraph 2 (a) of the report. The General Committee recommends the inclusion in the agenda of the current session of an additional item, entitled "Financing of the United Nations military liaison team in Cambodia".

May I take it that the Assembly decides to include that additional item in its agenda?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: In paragraph 2 (b) of the report, the General Committee also recommends that the item be allocated to the Fifth Committee.

May I take it that the Assembly approves of this recommendation?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: The Chairman of the Fifth Committee will be informed of the decisions just taken.

Next, I should like to draw the attention of representatives to paragraph 3 (a) of the report. The General Committee recommends the inclusion in the agenda of the current session of an additional item, entitled "Emergency action to combat locust infestation in Africa".

May I take it that the Assembly decides to include that additional item in its agenda?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: In paragraph 3 (b) of the report, the General Committee also recommends that the item be considered directly in plenary meeting.

May I take it that the Assembly adopts that recommendation of the General Committee?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: May I also take it that, as requested by the sponsor, the item should be considered by the Assembly as soon as possible because of its urgent character?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: It is my intention therefore to schedule this new item, which becomes item 175 of the agenda of the forty-eighth session, for consideration by the Assembly on Friday, 19 November, in the morning, as the first item, on the understanding that the agenda item will not be debated and that the Assembly will have before it a draft resolution for consideration.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.